

MG101 'Introduction to Management' F2F – Group Project Marking Criteria (Semester 1 2014)

Total Mark: 100/100 (to be converted to 15%)

Facets	Elements	Distinction 78 – 100%	Credit 64 – 77%	Pass 50 – 63%	Fail (below standard) 40 – 49%	Fail (Very weak performance) Less than 40%	Marks Allocated
Embark and clarify	Introduction (10 Marks)	Establishes the context to the subject and presents the issue statement. Line of argument taken clearly and effectively.	Establishes the context to the subject and presents the issue statement and line of argument taken clearly.	Establishes the context to the subject and presents the issue statement and line of argument taken but some parts are vague.	Attempts to link the context to the subject and presents the issue statement but weakly linked and has no line of argument.	Introduction incomplete, flawed or missing.	
Find and generate	Research (Literature Review) (15 Marks)	Wide range of appropriate and relevant references, fully integrated into the text with a sound mix of direct and indirect quotations. Quotations support arguments. Citations are totally accurate. Bibliography complete and accurate.	A range of appropriate and relevant references, generally integrated into the text with a mix of direct and indirect quotations. Most quotations support arguments. Most citations correct. Bibliography good but has minor errors.	An attempt made to apply research to the assignment. The balance of direct and indirect quotations is uneven. Quotations occasionally replace student input. Citations show several errors. Bibliography is satisfactory.	Application or research to assignment is uncertain. Heavy reliance on one or two sources. Relevance and balance of direct and indirect quotations is questionable. Quotations often replace student input. Citations show many errors. Bibliography has many errors.	No evidence of research. No proper research method used	
	Research Methodology (5 Marks)	Research methods fully and thoroughly discussed	Research method is well discussed	Research method is briefly discussed	Research method is poorly discussed		
Evaluate and Reflect	Quality of analysis (40 Marks)	Presents a strong, focused argument, well supported by impressive analysis and evidence. The points being made are clear and convincing for the reader throughout the project.	Presents an argument with relevant analysis and supporting evidence. The points being made are clear to the reader.	Presents an argument with some analysis but also some description/summary. The points being made can be followed with some effort.	The argument is not clear with more summary and “telling the story” than analysis. The point of the write up becomes lost in places.	No argument or evidence provided. There doesn't seem to be any real point in the project .	
Conclusion	Thoughtful final perspective and has a powerfully convincing conclusion. (20 Marks)	Has a clear conclusion which brings together the main points and answers the question			Has a conclusion with little detail/unclear.	No conclusion.	
Organize and manage	Plan and References (10 Marks)	Clear identification and separation of relevant ideas with details.	Some distinction of ideas but it is not consistent.		Ideas do not reflect the issue. Major elements are missing.	No apparent plan.	

Copyright © MG101 Course Coordinator Ms Maureen Karan, The University of the South Pacific, 2014. Available under [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License](#) References: Ms Naolah Pitia and RSD Consultant Dr John Willison, MG101 RSD marking rubric for research report, 2013. Willison, J. and O'Regan, K., 2006 and 2013. *The RSD Framework*.