

LEVEL 6 ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

Student name:		Student ID number:	
Programme:	BA Leadership and Management Skills for the Workplace		
Module:	Developing Innovation and Creativity for Business Advantage		
Module code:	BMSW6102	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):	100
Lecturer:	Dr Md Nazmul Hasan	Internal Verifier:	Yohan Mendis
Assignment Title:	Coursework (Case Study)	Word count (or equivalent):	Task 1: 2500 (+/- 10%) essay. Task 2: 15-20 minute interactive interview.
Submission deadline:	Written submission: 26/03/2021 15:00pm GMT Interview: W/C 29/03/2021	Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	May 2021
Submission method:	All written assessments, where practical and possible, must be submitted via Turnitin unless otherwise instructed by the Lecturer. (Please DO NOT put this assessment specification into Turnitin or it will match many similarities with other students' submissions.) Alternative submission method (if applicable): Late submission of the assessment will result in a late penalty mark. Penalties for late submission: Up to one week late, maximum mark of 40%. Over one week late, 0%. Only the Extenuating Circumstances Panel may approve a change to submission dates.		
Academic honesty / referencing:	Academic honesty is required. In the main body of your submission you must give credit to authors on whose research and ideas your work is based. Append to your submission a reference list that indicates the books, articles, etc. that you have used, cited or quoted in order to complete this assessment.		

Module Learning Outcomes (from module syllabus)

Upon the successful completion of this module, the student should be able to demonstrate the ability to:

- critically reflect on the innovation concept;
- recognise, analyse and apply creative thinking at the individual, team, organisational and industry level;
- critically explore and differentiate between different models of innovation;
- critically assess characteristics of organisational knowledge and organisational knowing.

TASK DESCRIPTION

Task 1: Written submission – 50%

Case Study: Developing a new product for the teeth whitening market

This case study tells the story of how Munich Gases uncovered a multi-billion dollar market opportunity for whitening teeth, and explored how best to exploit it. This is based on a true story. This was a genuine product idea which the company was not sure how to exploit. The key decision revolves around whether to enter the consumer market or the professional Dentist market with a more expensive industrial product.

.....

Stockholm products, based in Sweden, is an industrial gas company with a long history of supplying liquid oxygen to health care markets and carbon dioxide to the drinks and beverages industry. It has a rich history of successful R&D and this has helped it maintain its dominant position in the market over the past 80 years.

The company employs 32,000 people in more than 70 countries worldwide and sales last year were £12.1 billion with an annual R&D budget of £100 million. Recently it had to decide whether to invest 10% of this budget in a single project – teeth whitening.

Amongst over 100 projects running within R&D, was one that was exploring applications for the use of plasma as a cleaning agent. Plasma is an ionised gas capable of conducting electricity and absorbing energy from an electrical supply. When a gas absorbs electrical energy, its temperature increases, causing the ions to vibrate faster and hence “scrub” a surface. Stockholm products had found a patent submitted by the University of Southern California which claimed that plasma had been used to sterilise teeth and one of the side effects was a whitening of the teeth. This intrigued the scientists, and a team of researchers was set up to explore whether the idea could be a viable business opportunity. The team was given 12 months and a budget of £1 million.

The plasma cleaning project - 12 months later

The R&D Manager convened a meeting to review the project.

Michael Glass, the R&D project leader presented his findings. The results were promising. After reviewing milestones in the project, he showed some convincing slides. Using pig’s teeth (experimentation is not allowed on human teeth) the product that the research team had

developed showed some dramatic changes following exposure to the plasma. Discoloured yellow teeth noticeably changed to a shade of white.

Bernard Bing, the product development manager produced statistics that demonstrated a gap in the market for an effective simple teeth whitening product. He explained that it was a lucrative and growing market. Currently, for major toothpastes, averting tooth decay is not sufficient. Products now offer additional benefits such as fresher breath, healthier gums and whiter teeth. He cautioned that entry into this market would be difficult, given the extent of competitors and these multinationals, such as Colgate-Palmolive and Procter &Gamble had huge power. However, Bernard went on to say that this power also presented opportunities, especially when it comes to licensing technology. Powerful multinational brand management firms are always looking for competitive advantage and exclusive access to a unique technology would provide such an opportunity.

This was, indeed, food for thought.

Discussion continued with views being expressed:

- Dental scientists felt more research was needed to prove and fully explain the product
- Some business development managers thought that teeth whitening was a fad and the product should be marketed as a cleaning tool

However, one key issue dominated the meeting: Should the company target the professional market – i.e., dentists with large cylinders of plasma or the consumer market with a simple to use micro cylinder product.

Stefan Boch was Licensing Manager for Stockholm gases. He explained how licensing would allow the company to gain revenue from its plasma technology by licensing it to other companies so that it could be integrated into an end product. This option would enable the company to exit at this stage without any further additional costs and guarantee revenue for years to come.

Maria Klaus, the marketing manager had a different viewpoint. She thought that the consumer product offered the most potential. “I can envisage a hand held small plasma toothbrush in bathrooms all over the world” Maria went on to explain that, in her view, it was the business model that they constructed and selected would ultimately influence the outcome of discussions.

Decision Time

The R&D Manager was chairing the meeting and after 2 hours he decided to bring the panel members back to focus on the decision in front of them. “We need a decision today” he explained. “We need to make a recommendation to the board about whether to invest and we need to be clear and unambiguous”.

.....

Questions to answer:

- Should Munich Gases invest €10 million in this new product project? (Why/Why not?)
- What other factors may yet decide the fate of this project?
- Which market should Munich Gases select: the consumer product market or professional/business market?
- Should Munich Gases secure an entry into the market with one of Europe’s leading multiples (e.g. Lidl, Tesco, Carefour, Aldi)? (Why/Why not?)
- How can the firm reassure uneasy consumers about the safety of plasma in their mouths?

Task 2: Interactive interview (15-20 minute) – 50%

Students are required to take part in a 15-20 minute interactive interview to defend their written submissions. During this interactive interview, they will have to answer questions on the following topics:

- Procedures followed to complete the assignment. For example, what type of research was carried out? How relevant information was searched for and sorted? What concepts/theories/class notes were explored and how? Which external sources were most useful in writing the assignment?
- What were the main challenges faced in completing the assignment and how those challenges were overcome?
- What are the practical learning outcomes of the assignment and how it can benefit in the future?

GUIDANCE FOR STUDENTS IN THE COMPLETION OF TASKS

NOTE: The guidance offered below is linked to the five generic assessment criteria overleaf.

1. Engagement with Literature Skills

Your work must be informed and supported by scholarly material that is *relevant* to and *focused* on the task(s) set; you should make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources, where appropriate (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). You should provide evidence that you have accessed a wide *range* of sources, which may be academic, governmental and industrial; these sources may include academic journal articles, textbooks, current news articles, organisational documents, and websites. You should consider the *credibility* of your sources; academic journals are normally highly credible sources while websites require careful consideration/selection and should be used sparingly. Any sources you use should be current and up-to-date, mostly published within the last five years or so, though seminal/important works in the field may be older. You must provide *evidence* of your research/own reading throughout your work, using a suitable referencing system, including in-text citations in the main body of your work and a reference list at the end of your work.

Guidance specific to this assessment: *In addition to using reliable external sources, students must also do productive desk research on innovative ways of entering a new product to existing markets.*

2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills

At level 6, you should be able to demonstrate coherent and detailed knowledge and a systematic understanding of the subject area, at least some of which is informed by the latest research and/or advanced scholarship within the discipline. You should be aware of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge. Your work must demonstrate the growing extent of your knowledge and systematic understanding of concepts and underlying principles associated with the subject area. *Knowledge* relates to the facts, information and skills you have acquired through your learning. You demonstrate your *understanding* by interpreting the meaning of the facts and information (knowledge). This means that you need to select and include in your work the concepts, techniques, models, theories, etc. appropriate to the task(s) set. You should be able to explain the theories, concepts, etc. meaningfully to show your understanding. Your mark/grade will also depend upon the *extent* to which you demonstrate your knowledge and understanding; ideally each should be complete and detailed, with comprehensive coverage.

Guidance specific to this assessment: Students must demonstrate sufficient understanding of how and to what extent an innovative product is different from a traditional one, and of the challenges and/or opportunities an innovative product offer, particularly if the product is related to health and safety.

3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills

You should be able to: critically evaluate evidence, arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data some of which are at the forefront of a discipline (and that may be incomplete) to devise and sustain arguments, to make judgements and/or solve problems; describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline Your work must contain evidence of logical, analytical thinking, evaluation and synthesis. For example, to examine and break information down into parts, make inferences, compile, compare and contrast information. This means not just describing what! But also justifying: Why? How? When? Who? Where? At what cost? At all times, you must provide justification for your arguments and judgements. Evidence that you have reflected upon the ideas of others within the subject area is crucial to you providing a reasoned and informed debate within your work. Furthermore, you should provide evidence that you are able to make sound judgements and convincing arguments using data and concepts. Sound, valid conclusions are necessary and must be derived from the content of your work. Where relevant, alternative solutions and recommendations may be proposed.

Guidance specific to this assessment: Students must be able to demonstrate an ability to clarify their arguments with relevant examples and theoretical concepts. They must also be able to explain their arguments in a clear and concise manner.

4. Practical Skills

At level 6, you should be able to apply the methods and techniques that you have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply your knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. You will deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry relevant to the discipline, and apply them in complex and unpredictable contexts, to devise and sustain arguments and/or to solve problems. You should be able to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions. You should be able to demonstrate how the subject-related concepts and ideas relate to real world situations and/or a particular context. How do they work in practice? You will deploy models, methods, techniques, and/or theories, in that context or circumstances, to assess current situations, perhaps to formulate plans or solutions to solve problems, or to create artefacts, some of which may be innovative and creative. This is likely to involve, for instance, the use of real world artefacts, examples and cases, the application of a model within an organisation and/or benchmarking one theory or organisation against others based on stated criteria. You should show awareness of the limitations of concepts and theories when applied in particular contexts.

Guidance specific to this assessment: Students must be able to use language professionally and academically with proper citations (where relevant). They must be able to defend their written submissions during their interactive interviews.

5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice

Your work must provide evidence of the qualities and transferable skills necessary for graduate-level employment requiring the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility and decision-making in complex and unpredictable circumstances. This includes demonstrating: the learning ability for professional development to advance existing skills and acquire new competences of a professional nature that will enable you to assume significant responsibility within organisations; that you can initiate and complete tasks and procedures, whether individually and/or collaboratively; that you can use appropriate media to effectively communicate information, arguments and analysis in a variety of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences; fluency of expression; clarity and effectiveness in presentation and organisation. Work should be coherent and well-structured in presentation and organisation.

Guidance specific to this assessment: Student must approach their interviews professionally and be ready and able to answer any questions that are related to their assignment topic and are based on their written submissions.

STUDENT FEEDBACK FORM

This section details the *extent* to which the assessment criteria are demonstrated by you, which in turn determines your mark. The marks available for each category of skill are shown. Lecturers will use the space provided to comment on the achievement of the task(s), including those areas in which you have performed well and areas that would benefit from development/improvement.

Generic Assessment Criteria	Marks available	Marks awarded
1. Engagement with Literature Skills	Task 1: 10 Task 2: 10	
2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills	Task 1: 10 Task 2: 10	
3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills	Task 1: 10 Task 2: 10	
4. Practical Application Skills	Task 1: 10 Task 2: 10	
5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice	Task 1: 10 Task 2: 10	

Assessment Mark (Assessment marks are subject to ratification at the Exam Board. These comments and marks are to give feedback on module work and are for guidance only until they are confirmed.)	Late Submission Penalties (tick if appropriate)		%
	Up to 1 week late (40% Max)		
	Over 1 week late (0%)		

GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Level 6

In accordance with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, at the end of Level 6 students should have coherent and detailed knowledge and a systematic understanding of their subject area, at least some of which is informed by the latest research and/or advanced scholarship within the discipline. They will be able to accurately deploy established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline, using their conceptual understanding to devise and sustain arguments and/or to solve problems. They should be aware of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge. They should be able to critically evaluate evidence, arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions. They will apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. They will have the ability to manage their own learning, and to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). They will demonstrate the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility; decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts; the learning ability needed to undertake appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.

Level 6	FAIL	MARGINAL FAIL	SATISFACTORY (3 rd / Pass)	GOOD (2.2 / Pass)	VERY GOOD (2.1 / Merit)	EXCELLENT (1 st / Distinction)	EXCEPTIONAL (1 st / Distinction)
Category	0-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-84%	85-100%
Engagement with literature (including reading, referencing, academic conventions and academic honesty)	Little or no evidence of reading and/or reliance on inappropriate sources. Views and findings mostly unsupported and non-authoritative. Referencing conventions used incoherently or largely absent.	Poor engagement with essential reading. No evidence of wider reading. Reliance on inappropriate sources, and/or indiscriminate use of sources. Heavily reliant on information gained through class contact. Inconsistent and weak use of referencing.	Engagement with a limited range of mostly relevant and credible sources. Some omissions and minor errors. Referencing conventions evident though not always applied accurately or consistently.	Engagement with an appropriate range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Some over-reliance on texts. Referencing may show minor inaccuracies or inconsistencies.	Engagement with a wide range of research-informed literature, including sources retrieved independently. Selection of relevant and credible sources. Very good use of referencing, with no/very few inaccuracies or inconsistencies.	Engagement with an extensive range of relevant and credible literature, informed by the latest research. Consistently accurate application of referencing.	Exceptional engagement with an extensive range of relevant and credible literature, informed by the latest research. High-level referencing skills consistently and professionally applied.
Knowledge and understanding (Coherent and detailed)	Major gaps in knowledge and systematic understanding of the subject	Gaps in knowledge, with only superficial systematic understanding.	Limited knowledge and systematic understanding of the relevant	Knowledge is reasonably detailed, accurate with a good systematic	Knowledge is reasonably extensive coherent and detailed.	Excellent coherent and detailed knowledge and systematic	Exceptionally coherent and detailed knowledge and systematic

Level 6	FAIL	MARGINAL FAIL	SATISFACTORY (3 rd / Pass)	GOOD (2.2 / Pass)	VERY GOOD (2.1 / Merit)	EXCELLENT (1 st / Distinction)	EXCEPTIONAL (1 st / Distinction)
Category	0-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-84%	85-100%
knowledge and systematic understanding of the subject area, at least some of which is informed by the latest research and/or advanced scholarship within the discipline.)	matter. Substantial inaccuracies. No awareness of knowledge of the latest research and/or advanced scholarship within the discipline.	Some significant inaccuracies and/or irrelevant material. No awareness of knowledge of the latest research and/or advanced scholarship within the discipline.	concepts and principles within the subject area which to some limited extent, is informed by current research and scholarship.	understanding of the field of study and to some extent, current research and scholarship.	Exhibits very good understanding of the breadth and depth of established views, and the work is, at least in part, well-informed by current research and scholarship.	understanding of the principles and theories of current research and scholarship. Clear awareness of challenges to established views and the limitations of the knowledge base.	understanding of the principles and theories of the subject, well-informed by current research and scholarship. A critical, sophisticated and nuanced awareness of the ambiguities and limitations of knowledge.
Cognitive and intellectual skills (Conceptual and critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and evaluation of research, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete); logic, argument and judgement.)	Wholly or almost wholly descriptive work. Little or no analysis, synthesis or evaluation. Failure to develop arguments, leading to illogical or invalid judgements. Unsubstantiated generalisations, made without use of any credible evidence.	Largely descriptive work, with superficial use of critical evaluation. Weak development of arguments and judgements. Information accepted uncritically, uses generalised statements made with scant evidence and unsubstantiated opinions. Ideas sometimes illogical and contradictory.	Limited attempt at critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and evaluation, tending towards description. Some evidence to support emerging arguments and judgements but these may be underdeveloped or with a little inconsistency / mis-interpretation. Asserts rather than argues a case.	Some critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Can analyse new and/or abstract concepts and data without guidance. An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence (that may be incomplete) to support the argument. Mostly valid arguments and logical judgements. Some tendency to assert/state opinion rather than argue on	Sound critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and evaluation demonstrating critical thinking. Ability to devise and sustain persuasive arguments, and to review the reliability, validity and significance of evidence (that may be incomplete) to make mostly appropriate and valid judgements.	Excellent critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Ability to investigate contradictory or incomplete information and make strong, persuasive, arguments and sophisticated judgements. Some evidence of independent thought and ability to 'see beyond the question', suggesting a grasp of the broader field and wider concepts.	Exceptional critical thinking, analysis, synthesis and evaluation based on judiciously selected evidence. Ability to investigate contradictory or incomplete information and make strong, persuasive, arguments and sophisticated, nuanced, judgements. Evidence of independent thought and ability to 'see beyond the question', suggesting an outstanding

Level 6	FAIL	MARGINAL FAIL	SATISFACTORY (3 rd / Pass)	GOOD (2.2 / Pass)	VERY GOOD (2.1 / Merit)	EXCELLENT (1 st / Distinction)	EXCEPTIONAL (1 st / Distinction)
Category	0-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-84%	85-100%
				the basis of reason and evidence.			grasp of the broader field and wider concepts.
Practical skills (Apply/deploy accurately established tools and techniques; initiate and carry out projects; formulate solutions to solve problems in complex and unpredictable contexts.)	Limited or no use of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Little or no appreciation of the context of the application. Limited understanding of the application of theory to practice or making appropriate links between the two. Very weak problem-solving skills in complex and unpredictable contexts.	Rudimentary application of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques but without consideration and competence. Flawed appreciation of the context of the application. Weak understanding of the application of theory to practice, with only occasional evidence of making appropriate links between the two. Weak problem-solving skills in complex and unpredictable contexts.	An adequate awareness and mostly appropriate application of well-established methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Basic appreciation of the context of the application. Theoretical knowledge and understanding applied in practice, but not always making logical links between the two. Can identify problems and propose basic solutions in complex and unpredictable contexts without fully appreciating the complexity.	A good and appropriate application of standard methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Clear appreciation of the context of the application. Mainly consistent, accurate and logical application of theory to practice, making appropriate links between the two. Can identify problems and propose mostly appropriate solutions in complex and unpredictable contexts.	A very good application of a range of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Very good consideration of the context of the application, with perceptive insights. Can identify problems and propose appropriate solutions in complex and unpredictable contexts. Evidence of some innovation and creativity.	An advanced application of a range of methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. The context of the application is well considered, and insightful. Application and deployment extend beyond established conventions. Can identify complex problems and propose excellent solutions. Innovation and creativity evident.	Exceptional levels of application and deployment skills in unpredictable, practical contexts, drawing skilfully on the latest research within the discipline. Can identify complex problems and propose sophisticated solutions. Assimilation and development of cutting edge processes and techniques.
Transferable skills for life and professional practice (Exercise of initiative and	Communication medium is inappropriate or misapplied. Work is poorly structured, disorganised	Communication medium is poorly designed and/or not suitable for the audience. Work is poorly presented in a	Can communicate in a suitable medium but with some room for improvement. Mostly ordered	Can communicate effectively in a suitable format, but may have minor errors. Mostly coherent,	Can communicate well, confidently and consistently in a suitable format. Work is	Can communicate professionally confidently and consistently in a suitable format. Work is	Can communicate with an exceptionally high level of professionalism. Work is

Level 6	FAIL	MARGINAL FAIL	SATISFACTORY (3 rd / Pass)	GOOD (2.2 / Pass)	VERY GOOD (2.1 / Merit)	EXCELLENT (1 st / Distinction)	EXCEPTIONAL (1 st / Distinction)
Category	0-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-84%	85-100%
personal responsibility; professional development; initiate and complete tasks and procedures: individually and/or collaboratively; use appropriate media to communicate effectively; fluency of expression; clarity and effectiveness in presentation and organisation.)	and/or confusingly expressed. Very weak use of language and/or very inappropriate style. Little or no evidence of autonomy (or collaboration, where relevant) in the completion of tasks. Little or no evidence of the skills required in graduate employment.	disjointed manner. It is loosely, and at times incoherently, structured, with information and ideas often poorly expressed. Weak use of language and/or inappropriate style. Weak independent initiative (or collaboration, if relevant). Limited evidence of the skills required in graduate employment.	presentation and structure in which relevant ideas / concepts are reasonably expressed. Work may lack coherence in places. Can work as part of a team, but with limited involvement in group activities. Demonstrates the basic skills required in graduate employment, with some areas of minor weakness.	organised work, in a suitable structure and is for the most part clearly expressed. Can work effectively independently and/or as part of a team, with clear contribution to group activities. Demonstrates the skills required in graduate employment, with some areas of strength and some of minor weakness.	coherent, fluent, well-structured and organised. Can work very well autonomously and/or as part of a team, with very good contribution to group activities. Demonstrates very good graduate employment skills, with just occasional minor weakness.	coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally. Can work autonomously with initiative. Where relevant can work professionally within a team, showing leadership skills as appropriate, managing conflict and meeting obligations. Demonstrates excellent graduate employment skills and an appetite for further development.	exceptionally coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally. Can work exceptionally well and professionally within a team, showing advanced leadership skills. Demonstrates exceptional graduate employment skills and an appetite for further development.

THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE IN WELSH