

LEVEL 4 ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

Student name:		Student ID number:	
Programme:	PT Engineering Portfolio - BEng Mechanical Engineering, Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering, Manufacturing Systems Engineering, Advanced Manufacturing Operations, BSc Engineering Management		
Module:	Study Skills		
Module code:	ACMA4039	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):	100%
Lecturer:	Dr Mohamed Gabr	Internal Verifier:	Dr Moutushi Tanha
Assignment Title:	Root Cause Analysis: Technical Report and Video Presentation	Word count (or equivalent):	1400 words + five-minute video Presentation
Submission deadline:	14/12/2026 9:00 am (Report 70%) 14/12/2026 9:00 am (video 30%)	Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	20 Working Term Time Days from Submission
Submission method:	All written assessments, where practical and possible, must be submitted via Moodle 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): N/A 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. The complete assessment must be submitted through one designated Moodle coursework submission link. Students must upload three files: ○ one written submission containing the 1,400-word technical report, with the Personal Development Plan included as an appendix; ○ one completed Excel RCA spreadsheet containing the supporting calculations and analysis; and ○ one five-minute video presentation.		
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.		
Work over the word limit:	To support fairness and good academic writing, each assessment has a set word limit. It's important that you stay within this limit. The word limit helps ensure:		

- You write clearly and concisely.
- All students complete the assessment on an equal basis.

If You Go Over the Word Limit

If your work exceeds the word limit, the following penalties will normally apply. These deductions cannot take your mark below the pass mark for the module.

Amount Over Limit	Penalty Applied
Up to 10% over	No penalty
10%–25% over	5 mark deduction <i>or</i> reduction to the capped mark (whichever is the smaller penalty)
26%–50% over	10 mark deduction <i>or</i> reduction to the capped mark (whichever is the smaller penalty)
Over 50%	Mark capped at the pass mark

Examples (Undergraduate):

- A mark of **44%** would be reduced to the pass mark of **40%** if the work is 10–25% over.
- A mark of **49%** would be reduced by 5 marks to **44%**.
- A mark of **47%** at 25–50% over would be reduced to **40%**.
- A mark of **55%** at 25–50% over would be reduced by 10 marks to **45%**.

If You Are Under the Word Limit

If your work is significantly under the word limit, you may lose marks because your submission may not contain enough detail to meet the learning outcomes.

Feedback

If a word-limit penalty is applied, this will be stated clearly in your feedback, along with the reason.

Engineering Council AHEP4 Learning Outcomes Assessed in this Module

C10	Adopt a holistic and proportionate approach to the mitigation of security risks.
C18	Plan and record self-learning and development as the foundation for lifelong learning / CPD.

You **MUST** demonstrate that the work submitted in completion of this assessment meets each of the AHEP4 learning outcomes listed above.

Module Learning Outcomes (from module syllabus)

- identify the value of the current skills in connection to the academic work and use personal development planning to enhance them;
- recognise academic writing standards, such as the usage of Harvard referencing and supporting documentation, and apply peer and self-evaluation feedback, as well as identify and build independent learning skills;
- identify the ethical concerns of academic research and gain knowledge of critical thinking and analysis in scholarly work.

TASK DESCRIPTION

Task 1

A structured approach to personal development is crucial for professional engineers, allowing them to identify areas for improvement, set goals, and acquire new knowledge and skills to stay up-to-date in a rapidly evolving field.

Studies have shown that Personal Development Plans (PDPs) are a valuable tool in this regard, promoting skills enhancement, career progression, adaptability, continuous improvement, leadership development, and achieving personal/professional growth.

Using the template provided to you (available on Moodle), you are required to develop a personal development plan aimed at managing your own learning towards the successful completion of the tasks described in task 2 (a & b) below. You may wish to include (but are not limited to) the following:

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Goal Description | 3. Support/Resources Required |
| 2. Planned Actions | 4. Deadlines |

You must also include a short self-evaluation of your progress and evidence of at least one item of formative feedback obtained from a peer, lecturer, workplace colleague or supervisor. Briefly explain how you used, or intend to use, this feedback to improve your report, Root Cause Analysis or presentation.

Task 2.a

Root Cause Analysis (RCA) is a method of problem-solving that aims to identify the root causes of faults or problems. By addressing these root causes, engineers can improve processes and systems, ensuring higher quality and reliability. In this task, you are required to conduct a Root Cause Analysis using a case study from your place of work. You have been provided with an Excel RCA template (available on Moodle). The RCA conducted should include:

- Identification of the problem
- Potential causes of the problem
- Root cause determination
- Allocation of severity, occurrence, and detection scores
- Summary of current controls
- Calculation of Risk Priority Numbers (RPN)
- Recommended corrective/mitigating actions
- calculation or evaluation of the revised or residual risk following the proposed actions; and

- identification of any relevant physical, operational, information or cyber-security risks associated with the case study, together with proportionate mitigating actions. Where no significant security risk is identified, this conclusion must be briefly justified.

All workplace, personal and commercially sensitive information must be anonymised.

Task 2.b

You are required to create a technical report, following the technical report-writing guidelines, in which you discuss the relevance of risk management to the manufacturing sector, including a review of the appropriate legal considerations governing sound engineering practice. You may approach this task from the perspective of your specific engineering stream or industrial experience, where appropriate.

Your technical report should also describe the process of conducting the Root Cause Analysis, with justification for the rankings and corrective actions selected.

The maximum word count for this component of the assessment is 1,400 words, excluding the reference list, Personal Development Plan, completed RCA spreadsheet, tables and appendices. Your report should provide a concise Level 4 discussion rather than an exhaustive legal or technical review.

Your report should contain the following sections:

1.Introduction	Outline the scope of the investigation and explain the importance of engineers understanding risk management. The aims and objectives of the work should also be clearly stated.
2.Literature Review	Present the knowledge and understanding gained through research into the subject area. Focus your discussion on the importance of risk management in the manufacturing sector and the use of tools such as RCA to mitigate risk. You are expected to refer to relevant health and safety legislation, risk-management principles and the IMechE Code of Conduct for professional engineers. You must also briefly consider relevant academic research ethics, including accurate representation of evidence, appropriate acknowledgement of sources, avoidance of plagiarism, responsible use of information and protection of confidential workplace data.
3.RCA	Present the results of your RCA and discuss and justify: ○ the severity, occurrence and detection rankings assigned; ○ the resulting RPN calculations; ○ the corrective or mitigating actions proposed; ○ any revised or residual risk remaining following the proposed actions; - and

	○ any relevant physical, operational, information or cyber-security risks. Your discussion must demonstrate a holistic and proportionate approach to risk mitigation.
4. Conclusion	Summarise the main findings of the investigation. You should consider both the RCA findings and the effectiveness, strengths and limitations of RCA as a tool for mitigating risk in the manufacturing sector.
5. References	Provide a comprehensive reference list correctly formatted according to the Harvard referencing convention.

Task 3

You are required to produce a five-minute video presentation communicating the findings of the Root Cause Analysis completed in Task 2.a to both technical and non-technical members of the workforce.

You may also include relevant information identified through the literature review completed in Task 2.b.

The presentation should:

- communicate the main problem, causes, rankings and RPN results;
- explain the principal corrective or mitigating actions;
- identify any relevant security risks and the proportionate actions proposed to mitigate them;
- communicate technical information in a form suitable for both technical and non-technical audiences; and
- be clear, concise and appropriately structured, making effective use of visuals or slides where required.

ASSESSMENT SUBMISSION

Submission for the complete assessment will be electronic through one designated Moodle coursework submission link.

Students must upload the following three files through the same Moodle submission link:

1. Written component – 70%

One written submission containing:

- the 1,400-word technical report;
- the Personal Development Plan included as an appendix; and
- clearly readable RCA summary tables or selected screenshots included within the report.

2. Completed RCA spreadsheet – supporting evidence

One completed Excel RCA spreadsheet showing:

- the severity, occurrence and detection scores;
- the RPN calculations;
- the proposed corrective or mitigating actions; and
- the revised or residual risk values.

3. Video component – 30%

One separate file containing the five-minute video presentation.

All three files must be uploaded before the stated submission deadline. The Moodle submission will be treated as one complete assessment submission covering the 70% written component and the 30% video component.

The completed RCA spreadsheet, Personal Development Plan, reference list, tables and appendices are not included in the 1,400-word limit.

Use of Generative AI in Assessment

(Lecturer to indicate Yes or Not against each element)

RESEARCH	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to support you in research, including searching for bibliography, using tools to summarise, compare and interrogate materials.	Yes ☒ No ☐
STRUCTURE	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to support you in structuring your submission, including creating a draft argument structure, identifying parts and headings, etc.	Yes ☒ No ☐
PROOFREADING	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to check your own text/creation for grammatical and syntactical mistakes, including rephrasing of your own work within specific standards.	Yes ☒ No ☐
WRITING	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to create text for submission.	Yes ☐ No ☒

CREATIVE	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to create creative materials, such as images.	Yes ☐ No ☒
PROGRAMING	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to create and check code.	Yes ☐ No ☒
NONE	For this assessment, you are not allowed to use any type of Generative AI support. This includes research support, structure support, writing/proofreading support and creative support.	Yes ☐ No ☒

NOTES:

- You should include a properly formatted Table of Contents, list of Tables/Figures in the beginning of your assignment.
- You should properly cite others' work within the body of your assignment (use Harvard referencing system) and provide a list of cited references at the end of your assignment. Copying and pasting a text from others' work is not acceptable. You should rephrase the text in a way that suits your needs.
- Work must follow the required formatting guidelines (Arial, size 12, 1.5 spacing). Marks may be deducted for failure to comply with presentation requirements.
- Students must save and submit their work using the following file naming convention: First name Surname_IDnumber_ACMA4039 (e.g. Alex Smith_2103456_ACMA4039).
- You may include appendices at the end of your assignment and refer to them in the body of your assignment when required.
- You should also provide an abstract at the beginning of your assignment.
- You should use heading and sub-headings in your assignment.

See the generic assessment criteria included at the end of this brief. This will be strictly followed to mark your assignments.

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 provide evidence that you have accessed an appropriate *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: Marks awarded for evidence of reading about risk management and Root Cause Analysis. Emphasis is placed on use of scholarly literature (journal articles etc.). In-text citations are expected to show which sections of your work have been informed by your use of literature, along with a references list at the end of the report, all formatted in accordance with the Harvard Referencing Convention.

2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills

At level 4, you should be able to demonstrate knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with your area(s) of study. *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. to show your understanding. Your mark/grade will also depend upon the *extent* to which you demonstrate your knowledge and understanding.

Guidance specific to this assessment: This relates to your demonstration of knowledge on the areas of risk management in engineering. Demonstration of the potential uses, limitations and implications of these concepts.

3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills

You should be able to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of your subject(s) of study. You should be able to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to your area(s) of study and/or work. Your work must contain evidence of logical, analytical thinking. 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? You should provide justification for your arguments and judgements using evidence that you have reflected upon the ideas of others within the subject area and that you are able to make sound judgements and arguments using data and concepts. Where relevant, alternative solutions and recommendations may be proposed.

Guidance specific to this assessment: Your justifications for your choices, based on sound engineering discussion and informed by your use of literature. Case studies and previous examples of similar practice can be an excellent way of showing your contextual understanding.

4. Practical Skills

At level 4, you should be able to apply the basic underlying concepts and principles to evaluate and interpret these within the context of your area of study. 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, to assess current situations,

perhaps to formulate plans or solutions to solve problems, or to create artefacts. 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.

Guidance specific to this assessment: *How well you have generated realistic ranking values for the RCA items, with justification based on engineering understanding. The quality and justification of the corrective actions proposed.*

5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice

Your work must provide evidence of the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility. This includes demonstrating: that you can communicate the results of your study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments; that you can initiate and complete tasks and procedures, whether individually and/or collaboratively; 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: *Quality of the written report, with correct formatting, presentation etc. Adhere to the technical report writing guidelines.*

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 - Written component – 70 marks	Marks available	Marks awarded
1. Engagement with Literature Skills		
<i>Marks will be awarded for evidence of reading about risk management and Root Cause Analysis. Emphasis is placed on the use of scholarly literature (journal articles etc.). In-text citations are expected to show which sections of your work have been informed by your use of literature, along with a references list at the end of the report, all formatted in accordance with the Harvard Referencing Convention.</i>	10	
2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills		
<i>This relates to your demonstration of knowledge in the areas of risk management in engineering. Demonstration of the potential uses, limitations, and implications of these concepts. Marks will be awarded for demonstrating knowledge and understanding of risk management and RCA, including their uses, limitations and implications within engineering practice.</i>	15	
3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills		
<i>Your justifications for your choices, based on sound engineering discussion and informed by your use of literature. Case studies and previous examples of similar practice can be an excellent way of showing your contextual understanding.</i>	15	
4. Practical Application Skills		
<i>How well you have generated realistic ranking values for the RCA items, with justification based on sound engineering understanding. The quality and justification of the corrective actions proposed.</i>	20	
5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice		
<i>Quality, structure and professional presentation of the written report; adherence to the technical report-writing guidelines; and the quality of the Personal Development Plan, including realistic goals, planned actions, deadlines, self-evaluation and use of formative feedback.</i>	10	

Generic Assessment Criteria - Video component – 30 marks	Marks available	Marks awarded
1. Accuracy and selection of RCA findings		
<i>Marks will be awarded for the accurate selection and explanation of the main problem, causes, rankings, RPN results, corrective or mitigating actions, residual risks and any relevant security risks.</i>	10	
2. Communication to technical and non-technical audiences		
<i>Marks will be awarded for communicating technical information clearly and accurately in language appropriate for both technical and non-technical members of the workforce.</i>	10	
3. Structure, clarity, visuals and professional delivery		
<i>Marks will be awarded for a clear and logical structure, effective use of appropriate visuals, professional presentation and delivery, and adherence to the five-minute duration.</i>	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 4

In accordance with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, at the end of Level 4 students will be expected to have demonstrated knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles of a subject, and an ability to evaluate and interpret these within the context of that area of study. They should be able to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study. They will have learned how to evaluate different approaches to solving problems, and will be able to communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments. They will be able to undertake further training and develop new skills within a structured and managed environment and will have the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.

Level 4	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 but with some reliance on information gained through class contact. Some omissions and minor errors. Referencing conventions evident though not always applied accurately or consistently.	Engagement with an appropriate range of literature, including sources retrieved independently. Some over-reliance on texts rather than other sources. Referencing may show minor inaccuracies or inconsistencies.	Engagement with a wide range of literature, including sources retrieved independently. Selection of relevant and credible sources. Generally sound referencing, with no/very few inaccuracies or inconsistencies.	Engagement with an extensive range of relevant and credible literature. Consistently accurate application of referencing.	Exceptional engagement with an extensive range of relevant and credible literature. High-level referencing skills consistently applied.
Knowledge and understanding (Knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and	Major gaps in knowledge and understanding of the basic underlying concepts and	Gaps in knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles, with flawed or	Limited knowledge and understanding of the basic underlying concepts and	Knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles is accurate with a	Competent knowledge of the basic underlying concepts and principles. Exhibits very	Excellent knowledge and understanding of the basic underlying concepts and	Exceptional, detailed knowledge and understanding of the basic underlying

Level 4	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%
principles of a subject.)	principles of the subject matter. Inclusion of irrelevant material. Substantial inaccuracies.	superficial understanding. Some significant inaccuracies and/or irrelevant material.	principles within the subject area. Some elements may be missing.	good understanding of the field of study but lacks depth and/or breadth.	good understanding.	principles of the subject.	concepts and principles
Cognitive and intellectual skills (Evaluate underlying concepts and principles of a subject and interpret qualitative and quantitative data in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements.)	Wholly or almost wholly descriptive work. Little or no evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Failure to develop arguments, leading to illogical or invalid judgements. Minimal or no use of evidence to back up views.	Largely descriptive work, with superficial evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Weak interpretation of data, flawed 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 evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles, tending towards description. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data but with some errors. Some evidence to support emerging arguments and judgements but these may be underdeveloped or with a little inconsistency / mis-interpretation.	Good evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data, with minor errors. An emerging ability to use evidence to support the argument. Mostly valid arguments and logical judgements.	Sound evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data accurately. Ability to devise arguments using evidence to make mostly appropriate and valid judgements.	Excellent evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles. Can interpret qualitative and quantitative data accurately and with some insight. Excellent ability to devise arguments using evidence and make appropriate and valid judgements.	Exceptional evaluation of the underlying concepts and principles based evidence. Outstanding interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data. Exceptional ability to devise arguments using evidence and make wholly appropriate and valid judgements.
Practical skills (Different approaches to solving problems in particular contexts.)	Limited or no use of taught, basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Little or no appreciation of the context of the application.	Rudimentary application of taught, basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques but without consideration and	An adequate awareness and mostly appropriate application of basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques.	A good and appropriate application of basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Clear appreciation of	A very good application of a range of basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. Very good consideration of the context of	An advanced application of a range of taught, basic methods, materials, tools and/or techniques. The context of the application is	Exceptional levels of application and deployment skills in particular practical contexts. Outstanding identification of

Level 4	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%
	Very weak evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts.	competence. Flawed appreciation of the context of the application. Weak evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts.	Basic appreciation of the context of the application. Can identify problems in particular contexts and propose basic alternative approaches or solutions though there may be errors.	the context of the application. Good evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts and proposes mostly appropriate solutions.	the application. Very good evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts and proposes appropriate solutions.	well considered, and insightful. Excellent evidence of different approaches to problem-solving in particular contexts and proposes appropriate solutions.	problems in particular contexts and formulation of wholly appropriate, thoughtful solutions / different approaches.
Transferable skills for life and professional practice (Communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments; the qualities needed for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility within a structured and managed environment.)	Work is poorly structured, disorganised, inaccurate and/or confusingly expressed. Very weak use of language and/or very inappropriate style. Failure to work effectively individual or as part of a group. Little or no evidence of the skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.	Work is poorly presented in a 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. Flawed approach to individual or group work, meeting only partial obligations to others. Limited evidence of the skills for employment requiring the	Mostly ordered presentation and structure in which relevant ideas / concepts are reasonably expressed. Work may lack coherence and/or accuracy in places. Can work as part of a group, meeting most obligations to others but perhaps with limited involvement in group activities. Demonstrates the basic skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility, with some areas	Mostly coherent, organised and accurate 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 for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility, with some areas of strength and some of minor weakness.	Work is accurate, coherent, fluent, well-structured and organised. Can work effectively independently and/or as part of a team, with very good contribution to group activities. Demonstrates very good skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility, with just occasional minor weakness.	Work is coherent, very fluent and is presented professionally. Can work effectively independently and/or as part of a team, with an excellent contribution to group activities. Demonstrates excellent skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility with an appetite for further development.	Work is accurate, exceptionally coherent, very fluent and presented well. Can work effectively independently and/or as part of a team, with an exceptional contribution to group activities. Demonstrates exceptional skills for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility with an appetite for further development.

Level 4	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%
		exercise of some personal responsibility.	of minor weakness.				

THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE IN WELSH