**Stage 3:** On/Off Campus **Module:** Strategic Human Resource Management

**Assignment Code:** HRM325 **Module Leader**

**Contribution to module assessment:** 100%

On/Before Monday 15th May 2023 before 23.55

**Submission via Canvas (Turnitin) Assessment Brief**

You are required to produce a report (3000 words) on the Strategic Management of Human Resources, (SHRM) for an OGANISATION OF YOUR CHOICE, which is currently operating at a National or Transnational (You can choose your organization from any sector; Private, Public or Not-for-Profit).

You will conduct a CRITICAL ASSESSMENT of the Strategic Human Resource Management, IDENTIFYING TWO areas of HRM practice that you feel NEED IMPROVEMENT. You must ANALYSE the organisation’s approach to managing those areas.

You will provide a RATIONALE for why you believe CHANGE IS NECESSARY and what ACTIONS the orgainsation needs to make.

You will need to reference your work (Harvard style) with appropriate underpinning academic theory and make use of both the lecture and seminar material. You may also include examples from other organisations where you feel comparisons are beneficial.

If you have any specific questions your workshop tutor will address them in class.

# Presentation and Word limits for assignments

**The presentation for this assignment will be:**

* **Front Sheet. (Provided).**
* **Contents page.**
* **Executive Summary.**
* **Introduction.**
* **Main body.**
* **Conclusion.**
* **Appendices, if needed.**
* **Reference List.**

**The word count is to be declared on the front page of your assignment. The word count does not include:**

* **Front Sheet, (provided).**
* **Contents page**
* **Executive Summary.**
* **Reference List**
* **Appendices**
* **Appropriate tables, figures and illustrations**

**Please note, in text citations [e.g. (Smith, 2011)] and direct secondary quotations [e.g. “*dib-dab nonsense analysis*” (Smith, 2011 p.123)] are INCLUDED in the word count**.

**Submission of Assessment:**

A single electronic copy (i.e. explanations, output reports and page images of graphic tools etc. pertaining to all tasks).

**The word count is 3000 words [+/- 10%] not including any appendices**.

The document should be properly structured with a table of contents, reference list (online and literature sources) and appendices (where necessary).

.

It is essential to retain a copy of your assignment for you own records.

Your mark and feedback will be made available to you electronically once the internal moderation process has taken place, you should note that at this stage marks are still subject to external examiner and academic board approval.

# Referencing your work

In this institution the Harvard method of referencing is used.

The Harvard method of referring to publications and of arranging references uses the author's name and the date of the publication. References are listed at the end of the text in alphabetical order by author's name. The general format of a journal reference is shown below:

**Smith, J. (1999) How to succeed! *Journal of Entrepreneurs,*1(2), p. 34-56**

Author’s name and initials are listed first, followed by year of publication in brackets. Then there is the title of article and the journal where article appears, which is underlined or in italics. Finally, state the volume and issue Number (in brackets) along with the pages where article can be located.

A guide to Harvard referencing will also be available in Canvas

# Academic Integrity and Misconduct:

Your attention is drawn to the University’s stated position on plagiarism. **THE WORK OF OTHERS, WHICH IS INCLUDED IN THE ASSIGNMENT MUST BE**

**ATTRIBUTED TO ITS SOURCE** (a full bibliography and/or a list of references must be submitted as prescribed in the assessment brief).

Please note that this is intended to be an individual piece of work. Action will be taken where a student is suspected of having cheated or engaged in any dishonest practice. Students are referred to the University regulations on plagiarism and other forms of academic irregularity. **Students must not copy or collude with one another or present any information that they themselves have not generated.**

**HRM325 Specific Assessment Criteria**

|  |
| --- |
| **HRM325-Strategic HRM** |
| **Criteria** | **Referred (0-19)** | **Referred (20-39)** | **3rd (40-49)** | **2:2****(50-59)** | **2:1****(60-69)** | **1st (70-79)** | **1st (80-100)** |
| **Awareness of Topical Issues** Critically identifies strategic HRM issues, prioritises these and applies topic specific concepts in a critical manner. | No evidence of research or reading. | Very little, inadequate research and reading | Some evidence of appropriate research and reading,but lacks academic argument.Little evidence of preparation and heavy reliance on few sources. | Good evidence of appropriate research and reading giving a well-balanced overview.Shows a good knowledge and understanding of the subject.Evidence of some research beyond core material. | Very good evidence of appropriate research and reading giving a well-balanced overviewShows very good awareness and an ability to discuss key points in a critical way. | Excellent evidence of appropriate research and reading giving an insightful and well- balanced overviewShows an excellent awareness of the subject and an ability to discuss key points in a critical and insightful way | Outstanding evidence of appropriate research and reading giving an insightful and well- balanced overviewShows an outstanding awareness of the subject and an ability to discuss key points in acritical and insightful way |
| **Analysis and Evaluation** Systematic interrogation of the theoretical models of SHRM. Extracts essential elements of HRM practice for discussion and relates to the wider contexts, model and perspectives in relation to strategic Human ResourceManagement. | Wholly descriptive with many key omissions. | Wholly descriptive and failing to mention key points. | Engages with key issues but in a descriptive way | Predominantly descriptive but some evidence of analytical thoughtSome key points and arguments considered but not fully developed | Predominantly analytical with good links to research publications and development of a coherent academic discussion.Evidence of an appreciation of conflicting points of view | Analytical and comparative with substantive links to research publications and development of an excellent academic discussion.Critical appreciation of conflicting points of view and how they relate to each other | Outstanding analytical and comparative work with substantive links to research publications and excellent academic discussion of these.Outstanding critical appreciation of conflicting points of view and how they relate to each other |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Integration of Theory and Practice**Able to filter theory and critique into coherent and consistent arguments. Shows evidence of undertaking relevant reading and backs up discussions with a credible evidence base in order to consider theissues raised by the assignment. | No evidence of understanding or integration and application of relevant theory | Very little, inadequate, evidence of understanding or integration and application of relevant theory | Some understanding and integration and application of relevant theory but with errors | Clear evidence of understanding and application of integration and relevant theory, largely correct with minor errors of detail | Significant, relevant understanding and integration and application of relevant theory with few very minor errors of minor detail | Significant relevant and correct understanding and integration and application of relevant theory in an insightful and critical way | Outstanding significant relevant and correct understanding and integration and application of relevant theory in an insightful and critical way |
| **Practical Implications and Conclusion** Clearly identifies the consequences of case issues and considers the impact of solutions in practice.Acknowledges the feasibility of recommendations and produce a clear and justified conclusion. | No conclusion and/ or recommendations | Conclusion unrelated to the preceding discussion orto the assignment brief.Recommendations are limited and / or largely unrelated | Conclusion is relevant but unclear in some aspects, requires further justificationRecommendations are limited | Conclusion relates to the identified topic and to the preceding discussion with reasonable justificationSome articulation recommendations | Conclusion relates clearly and logically to the identified topic and to the preceding discussion; well justified and explained with mention of limitationsRecommendations are detailed and relevant and justified | Conclusion is concise and insightful; relates clearly and logically to the identified topic and to the preceding discussion; excellent justification and discussion of limitationsWell justified recommendations | Conclusion demonstrates outstanding insight and comprehensiveness in addition to the other good qualities mentionedExtremely detailed and well justified recommendations |

**Generic Assessment Criteria – Undergraduate Bachelor’s degree**

**These should be interpreted according to the level at which you are working**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Categories** |
|  | **Grade** | **Relevance** | **Knowledge** | **Analysis** | **Argument and Structure** | **Critical Evaluation** | **Presentation** | **Reference to Literature** |
| Pass | 86 – | The work examined is exemplary and provides clear evidence of a complete grasp of the knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to the Level of the |
| 100% | qualification. There is also unequivocal evidence showing that all the learning outcomes and responsibilities appropriate to that Level are fully satisfied. At this level it is |
|  | expected that the work will be exemplary in all the categories cited above. It will demonstrate a particularly compelling evaluation, originality, and elegance of argument, |
|  | interpretation or discourse. |
| 76-85% | The work examined is excellent and demonstrates comprehensive knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to the Level of the qualification. There is also |
|  | excellent evidence showing that all the learning outcomes and responsibilities appropriate to that level are fully satisfied. At this level it is expected that the work will be |
|  | excellent in the majority of the categories cited above or by demonstrating particularly compelling evaluation and elegance of argument, interpretation or discourse and |
|  | there may be some evidence of originality |
|  | The work examined is of a high standard and there is evidence of comprehensive knowledge, understanding and skills appropriate to the Level of the qualification. |
| 70 – | There is also clearly articulated t evidence demonstrating that all the learning outcomes and responsibilities appropriate to that level are satisfied At this level it is |
| 75% | expected that the standard of the work will be high in the majority of the categories cited above or by demonstrating particularly compelling evaluation and elegance of |
|  | argument, interpretation or discourse. |
|  | Directly relevant to | A substantial | Good analysis, | Generally coherent and | May contain some | Well written, with | Critical appraisal of up-to- |
| 60 – | the requirements | knowledge of | clear and orderly | logically structured, using | distinctive or | standard spelling | date and/or appropriate |
| 69% | of the assessment | relevant material, |  | an appropriate mode of | independent thinking; | and grammar, in a | literature. Recognition of |
|  |  | showing a clear |  | argument and/or | may begin to | readable style with | different perspectives. |
|  |  | grasp of themes, |  | theoretical mode(s) | formulate an | acceptable format | Very good use of source |
|  |  | questions and |  |  | independent position |  | material. Uses a range of |
|  |  | issues therein |  |  | in relation to theory |  | sources |
|  |  |  |  |  | and/or practice. |  |  |
|  | Some attempt to | Adequate | Some analytical | Some attempt to construct | Sound work which | Competently | Uses a variety of literature |
| 50 – | address the | knowledge of a fair | treatment, but | a coherent argument, but | expresses a coherent | written, with only | which includes some |
| 59% | requirements of | range of relevant | may be prone to | may suffer loss of focus | position only in broad | minor lapses from | recent texts and/or |
|  | the assessment: | material, with | description, or to | and consistency, with | terms and in uncritical | standard grammar, | appropriate literature, |
|  | may drift away | intermittent | narrative, which | issues at stake stated only | conformity to one or | with acceptable | though not necessarily |
|  | from this in less | evidence of an | lacks clear | vaguely, or theoretical | more standard views | format | including a substantive |
|  | focused passages | appreciation of its | analytical | mode(s) couched in | of the topic |  | amount beyond library |
|  |  | significance | purpose | simplistic terms |  |  | texts. Competent use of |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | source material. |
| 40 – | Some correlation | Basic | Largely | A basic argument is | Some evidence of a | A simple basic style | Some up-to-date and/or |
| 49% | with the | understanding of | descriptive or | evident, but mainly | view starting to be | but with significant | appropriate literature |
|  | requirements of | the subject but | narrative, with | supported by assertion | formed but mainly | deficiencies in | used. Goes beyond the |
|  | the assessment | addressing a | little evidence of | and there may be a lack | derivative. | expression or | material tutor has |
|  | but there are | limited range of | analysis | of clarity and coherence |  | format that may | provided. Limited use of |
|  | instances of | material |  |  |  | pose obstacles for | sources to support a point. |
|  | irrelevance. |  |  |  |  | the reader. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fail | 35 – | Relevance to the | A limited | Heavy | Little evidence of coherent | Almost wholly | Numerous | Barely adequate use of |
| 39% | requirements of | understanding of a | dependence on | argument: lacks | derivative: the writer’s | deficiencies in | literature. Over reliance |
|  | the assessment | narrow range of | description, | development and may be | contribution rarely | expression and | on |
|  | may be very | material | and/or on | repetitive or thin | goes beyond | presentation; the | material provided by the |
|  | intermittent, and |  | paraphrase, is |  | simplifying | writer may achieve | tutor. |
|  | may be reduced to |  | common |  | paraphrase | clarity (if at all) only |  |
|  | its vaguest and |  |  |  |  | by using a |  |
|  | least challenging |  |  |  |  | simplistic or |  |
|  | terms |  |  |  |  | repetitious style |  |