

# Examiner's Report

## Research and Analysis Project

### P40 (May 2020) submissions

There were 1,383 submissions in P40 and of these 911 (66%) passed an increase from the previous submission period. The rate of referral for poor academic conduct remained the same at 7% (93 submissions). The number of students that passed the Research Report and then failed the SLS reduced from 10% (P39) to 5% (P40).

The assessment criterion, detailing the standard expected of a pass standard submission, are published in appendix 1 of the Information Pack. Details of performance in each of the assessment criterion are provided below (students can fail more than one criterion).

Criterion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
% fail	10%	10%	24%	7%	2%	24%	5%	10%	11%

The themes that have emerged from the feedback provided by markers and moderators for individual criterion are provided below.

#### RESEARCH REPORT

##### Assessment criterion one

Students are generally able to identify appropriate models and /or frameworks. Work can be improved by including a justification of the choice of models or frameworks and the identification of the limitations of the models/frameworks.

Some students fail because of inappropriate selection of models or a limited focus on a particular technique, for example focusing on a narrow range of ratios for a topic 8 submission.

Students that are not successful in this criterion often use excessive cut and paste. As they have not explained the models or frameworks in their own words they have not demonstrated an understanding of the chosen model or framework.

Referencing study texts is acceptable.

##### Assessment criterion two

Having identified relevant models, students must then apply these to the topic. Students can fail in this area if the model is not relevant to the topic, or they have not explained how the model applies to the chosen organisation. Often this is because students have cut and pasted or are using too many direct quotes and so have not demonstrated their understanding.

It is important to relate the model or framework to the topic/question and to the organisation. The use of generic (often internet sourced) SWOTs or PETLEs for the organisation can lead to a referral to an Academic Conduct Officer.

##### Assessment criterion three

This is one of the areas students find most difficult. The main reason students are unsuccessful is that their work is descriptive and not evaluative. Students will often produce descriptive work

when they have not gathered sufficient information (and this is why students will fail both criterion 3 and 6). Asking students to consider the “why” question in relation to specific findings, and then to provide evidence to support their analysis may help students move from descriptive to evaluative writing.

The second webinar (available on demand) covers this area.

#### **Assessment criterion four**

The structure must be clear, with the student drawing conclusions based on the arguments presented. Graphs must be consistent with the narrative interpretation otherwise the implication is that the student doesn't understand the findings they are presenting.

Students will also fail this criterion if they are significantly over the word limit or due to an excessive use of inappropriate appendices.

**The graduate skills are assessed on a pass fail basis.**

#### **Assessment criterion five (communication)**

The research report must be written in a professional manner.

#### **Assessment criterion six (information gathering and referencing)**

This is often linked with criterion three. In order to evaluate effectively a student needs to gather relevant information. If a student relies extensively on limited sources (in particular in topic 8 relying on the Annual Report) then they are unlikely to have the evidence to support their argument.

For topics with primary data, the student should make reference to the data collected. If this is from interviews then quoting participants is acceptable. If a student fails to include evidence of permission (or that anonymity has been granted by the Programme Lead) for primary research they will fail this criterion.

Students also fail this criterion because systematic referencing skills are not effectively demonstrated. There is an article on the OBU web pages to help students understand the reasons for, and how to, reference.

#### **Assessment criterion seven (IT)**

The main reason student fail this criterion is that either they do not submit a spreadsheet, or the spreadsheet submitted does not show the use of formulae.

### **SKILLS AND LEARNING STATEMENT**

#### **Assessment criterion eight (Self reflection)**

The main reason students fail this criterion is that the reflection either descriptive, or is not personal. Some students appear to use other student's reflections or the exemplars as a basis of their work. This results in high Turnitin matches and possible Academic Conduct referrals.

The key to the reflection is to ask the student to consider what they have learnt from the RAP journey, what skills have they developed, what advice would they give others, what would they do differently and why. There are no “right” answers here, we are looking to see that the student is capable of learning from an experience and thinking about how that would help them in the future.

The third webinar (available on demand) covers reflective writing and the SLS.

### **Assessment criterion nine (presentation)**

Students can fail this criterion for either providing insufficient relevant information, or by providing too many slides with far too much information on them to make them easily legible by an audience.

The presentation should cover the student's research, focussing on their findings, analysis and conclusions. So slides explaining types of data, and information gathering, and even a description of a SWOT or PESTLE are not relevant. If a student produces slides with just graphs and not accompanying explanation, it is unlikely to be sufficient. The key is explaining the analysis and how conclusions have been reached.

It is possible to provide too much information on a slide. If the student is reproducing paragraphs of writing in a small font, it is not an effective presentation and is not deliverable in 15 minutes.

### **Academic Conduct Issues**

Some students' work have been referred to an Academic Conduct Officer (ACO) for investigation. We refer work when we believe the student has submitted work that is not their own. This includes extensive cut and paste with limited or very poor referencing, work that appears to have been copied or paraphrased from another student (this is often in the SLS) or where a student appears to have used a template.

### **Period 41 submission**

For Period 41 submissions, we will limit the size of files that students can upload. The limit for each element is as follows:

Element of assignment	File size
Research Report (word)	5MB
Presentation (powerpoint)	10MB
SLS (word)	250kB
Spreadsheet (Excel)	2MB
Reference list (word)	1MB
Appendices	2MB

Students will not be able to upload the Annual Report for an organisation. The Annual Report for each year considered must be included in the reference list.

For example, the in-text citation for the Annual Report of Jaguar Land Rover is

Jaguar Land Rover (2018/19) or (Jaguar Land Rover, 2018/19)

with the citation in the reference list being

Jaguar Land Rover (2018/19) *Jaguar Land Rover Automotive PLC Annual Report* available from <http://annualreport2019.jaguarlandrover.com/> (accessed 8/10/2020)