|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appropriate and accurate business**  **performance data analysis**    ULO1, ULO2, ULO3,  GLO1, GLO5, GLO3    (50 marks) | 0 points    Does not use appropriate data  analysis techniques.    There are **many errors** in the analysis.    **Conclusions** are incomplete and have  multiple errors and are typically not  appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Does not provide an appropriate and  accurate **charts/graphs**  (where appropriate), and with formatting  and accuracy errors.    The analysis is **not provided**, typically  **poorly presented** and disorganised.    Workings frequently appear in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, and key  analysis frequently appears in the  Workings (or similar) section.    (0 - 12.4 marks) | <25 points    Uses **inappropriate** (or irrelevant) techniques  to analyse the data.    There are **many errors** in the analysis.    **Conclusions** are incomplete and/or  have multiple errors  and/or are typically not appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Does not provide an appropriate and  accurate **charts/graphs**  (where appropriate), with formatting, and/or accuracy  exceptions or errors.    The analysis is **incomplete**, and/or  **poorly presented** and/or highly  disorganised.    Workings frequently appear in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, and/or key  analysis appears in the  Workings (or similar) section.    (12.5 - 24.9 marks) | >25 points    Uses **appropriate** techniques to analyse  the data, but there are **many errors** in the analysis.    **Conclusions** have multiple errors and/or  are not appropriate for  a specialist audience.    Does not provide an appropriate and  accurate **charts/graphs**  (where appropriate), or with formatting, and/or accuracy  exceptions or errors.    A **basic presentation** of the analysis.    Workings frequently appear in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, and/or key  analysis appears in the  Workings (or similar) section.    (25 - 29.9 marks) | >30 points    Uses **appropriate** techniques to analyse  the data, but there are **some errors** in the analysis.    Provides broadly **correct conclusions,**  with some errors, and/or generally  appropriate for a  specialist audience,.    Provides appropriate and accurate  **charts/graphs** (where appropriate), with some formatting, and/or accuracy  exceptions or errors.    An **good presentation** of the analysis.    Workings often appear in Reporting (e.g.  Output) sections, and/or key analysis appears in the  Workings (or similar) section.    (30 - 34.9 marks) | >35 points    **Comprehensive**  analysis of the data using appropriate  techniques to produce **accurate results**, with only minor errors.    Provides broadly **correct conclusions** appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Provides appropriate and accurate  **charts/graphs** (where appropriate), with  good formatting, and/or minor  exceptions or errors.    An **well organised presentation** of the analysis.    With few exceptions appropriate analysis appears in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, with most  supporting workings confined to the  appropriate location  (e.g. Workings section).    (35 - 39.9 marks) | 50 points    **Clear** and **complete** analysis of the data using appropriate  techniques to produce **accurate results.**    Provides concise and **correct conclusions** that are clear,  coherent, logical and appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Provides appropriate and accurate  **charts/graphs** (where  appropriate), with clear formatting.    An **exemplary presentation** of the  analysis, appropriate for a professional analyst.    Only appropriate analysis appears in the  Reporting (e.g. Output) sections, with all  supporting workings confined to the  appropriate location  (e.g. Workings section).    (40 - 50 marks) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Insightful interpretation of the analysis**    ULO2, ULO4,  GLO5, GLO2    50 marks | 0 points    **No explanation** the main findings of the analysis.    The answers to questions do not draw on (make reference to) any **analysis**.    **Explanations/ reasoning** are  incomplete and have substantial logic and  coherence errors.    The technical **argument** is unclear, incoherent, has  substantial logic  errors, and is not appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Does not provide clear **recommendations**.    Recommendations are not supported by  **good explanations**.    Narrative makes no reference to  **appropriate analysis**. | <25 points    Does **not adequately explain** the main findings of the analysis.    The answers to most questions does not draws on (make  reference to) any  **substantial** **analysis**.    **Explanations/ reasoning** are  incomplete and have logic and coherence errors.    The technical **argument** is unclear, incoherent, and has  logic errors, and is not appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Does not provide  TWO clear **recommendations**.    Recommendation are not supported by  **good explanations**.    Recommendations do not draw on (make | >25 points    **Adequately explains** the main findings of the analysis.    The answers to most questions only draws on (make reference to) **basic analysis**,  with some significant errors.    **Explanations/ reasoning** are  incomplete and/or  have logic/coherence errors.    The technical **argument** is often  unclear, incoherent, has logic errors and/or is not  appropriate for a  specialist audience.    Does not provide  TWO clear **recommendations**.    One recommendation is not supported by **good explanations**.    Only one | >30 points    **Accurately explains** the main findings of the analysis.    The answers to most questions draws on  (make reference to) **good analysis**, with  only some errors.    The answers to most of the questions are supported by good,  coherent, and logical **explanations/**  **reasoning**.    The technical **argument** is generally clear,coherent, logical and  appropriate for a  specialist audience,  with some exceptions.    TWO clear **recommendations**.    Each recommendation is supported by **good explanations**.    Each recommendation draws on (make | >35 points    Provides **detailed explanations** **and**  **insightful answers** to all questions.    The answers to most questions draws on  (make reference to) **appropriate and comprehensive**  **analysis**, with only minor errors.    The answers to most of the questions are  supported by very good, insightful,  coherent, and logical **explanations/**  **reasoning**.    With minor exceptions the  technical **argument** is clear,coherent, logical and  appropriate for a  specialist audience.    TWO clear and succinct  **recommendations**.    Each recommendation | 50 points    Provides an **outstanding**  **explanation** **and**  **insightful answer** to all questions.    The answers to all questions draws on  (make reference to) **appropriate and comprehensive analysis**.    The answers to all questions are  supported by carefully considered, insightful,  coherent, and logical **explanations/**  **reasoning**.    The technical **argument** is clear,  coherent, logical and appropriate for a  specialist audience.    TWO clear and succinct  **recommendations**.    Each recommendation is supported by an **outstanding and** |
|  | The **narrative** is unclear, illogical and  not appropriate for a non-specialist audience.    The written communication is  poorly structured, has grammatical errors  and does not adhere to the appropriate format.    (0 - 12.4 marks) | reference to)  **appropriate analysis**.    The **recommendations**  **and supporting**  **arguments** are  unclear, illogical and  not appropriate for a non-specialist audience.    The written communication is  poorly structured, has grammatical errors  and does not adhere to the appropriate format.    (12.5 – 24.9 marks) | recommendation  draws on (make  reference to)  **appropriate and good analysis**.    The **recommendations and supporting**  **arguments** are often unclear, illogical and/or not  appropriate for a non-  specialist audience.    The written communication is typically not well structured, has  grammatical errors  and/or does not adhere to the  appropriate format.      (25 - 29.9 marks) | reference to)  **appropriate and good analysis**.    With some notable exceptions, the  **recommendations and supporting**  **arguments** are clear,logical and generally  appropriate for a non-  specialist audience.    With some exceptions the written  communication is well structured, generally free of grammatical  errors and adheres to the appropriate format.    (30 – 34.9 marks) | is supported by **very good and insightful explanations**.    Each recommendation draws on (make  reference to)  **appropriate and very good analysis**.    With only minor exceptions, the  **recommendations and supporting**  **arguments** are clear,coherent, logical and  appropriate for a non-  specialist audience.    The written communication is well structured, generally free of grammatical  errors and adheres to the appropriate format.    (35 - 39.9 marks) | **insightful**  **explanation**.    Each recommendation draws on (make reference to)  **appropriate and comprehensive analysis**.    The **recommendations and supporting**  **argument** is clear,  coherent, logical and  appropriate for a non-  specialist audience.    The written communication is well structured, free of  grammatical errors and adheres to the  appropriate format.    (40 - 50 marks) |