

DSAW7074 – Leading for Sustainability Module-Specific Marking Criteria	
Specific module mark range	
80%+	An exceptional submission of potentially publishable standard, and which fully addresses all the criteria referred to in the 70-79% category below.
70 - 79%	An excellent, thorough and comprehensive knowledge of sustainable development demonstrated. Shows excellent ability to critically evaluate a range of sustainable development concepts with some originality. Analysis of the interaction of personal, social, environmental, economic, and legislative contexts of sustainability shows a strong ability to inter-relate concepts and ideas and to evaluate theory critically at the appropriate level. Assessment and critical analysis of the challenges and opportunities of implementing sustainable development in a range of workplaces is well-evidence and strongly linked to relevant theories. Makes points clearly and precisely, always uses a wide range of source materials which are appropriately referenced to substantiate points. Coherent argument which is methodically analysed supports a reliable conclusion based on discussion and examination. Evidence of independent thought. The reading cited is extensive and very relevant. Sustainability Policy demonstrates a high level of knowledge and understanding of theories and concepts, is coherently evaluated and reflected upon with the wider theoretical context, and demonstrates originality. Framework for implementation is methodically analysed and conclusions are based on discussion, examination, and strong or original use of analytical tools.
60 – 69%	A very good knowledge of sustainable development demonstrated through critical evaluation of a range of sustainable development concepts. Analysis of the interaction of personal, social, environmental, economic, and legislative contexts of sustainability shows an ability to inter-relate concepts, ideas and, practical examples and to evaluate theory. Assessment and critical analysis of the challenges and opportunities of implementing sustainable development in a range of workplaces is supported by evidence and linked to relevant theories. Discussion is at an appropriate level. Points are substantiated with appropriate evidence. Content is relevant and links are made between all paragraphs and sections. Reading cited is very good and the conclusion relevant to the discussion. Sustainability Policy demonstrates very good knowledge and understanding of theories and concepts and is coherently evaluated and reflected upon with the wider theoretical context. Framework for implementation is methodically analysed and conclusions are based on discussion, examination, and sound use of analytical tools.

50 – 59%	This submission meets the criteria for a pass. A satisfactory knowledge of sustainable development demonstrated through sound and generally relevant evaluation of sustainable development concepts. Analysis of the interaction of personal, social, environmental, economic, and legislative contexts of sustainability shows an understanding of issues, but limited ability to apply theory and concepts critically. Assessment and critical analysis of the challenges and opportunities of implementing sustainable development in a range of workplaces is not always supported by evidence and links to relevant theories are limited or contain errors of understanding. Line of reasoning not always clear and there is sometimes a lack of coherence. Work can be inappropriately descriptive for this level. There is some evidence of points made which are unsubstantiated and some examples of work not cited. Sustainability Policy demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of theories and concepts and is coherently evaluated, but reflection within the wider theoretical context is limited. Analysis of the framework for implementation makes use of appropriate analytical tools, but methodical analysis is limited and conclusions are not always clearly drawn from the analysis presented.
0 – 49% (Fail)	Reflection/discussion is generally at a very low level, being essentially descriptive rather than evaluative or yields neither substantive conclusions nor recommendations. Further analysis and evaluation is required at this level. Some references are made to theory but this is very limited and the vocabulary used is not always appropriate. Very insubstantial with serious deficiencies, for example, some components have been omitted or treated cursorily. Insufficient evidence of knowledge and understanding and/or engagement with the subject related to the specific learning outcomes of the module. No understanding of different approaches related to a wider context or within a work-based setting. No focus on relevant aspects and little or no coherence. No work submitted.