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Students are required to produce a sustainability report which (1) investigates the sustainability problems and challenges posed by business activities in a particular industry sector of their choice and (2) explores possible sustainable business solutions and the direction for future sustainability developments in the chosen industry. The report should be written for a professional, non-expert audience interested in both the need for and options for shifting activities in the chosen industry onto a sustainable footing. The analysis of problems should comprise not less than 20 per cent of the report and the analysis of solutions should comprise not less than 50 per cent.

There is flexibility in the choice of the industry sector for investigation. The question of problems may be explored concerning a broad industry (e.g., automobiles, food) or a more narrowly defined segment (e.g., tires, fast food). The exploration of solutions may also be approached across a range of levels from technical innovations to strategic and systemic changes. Given the word limit, the choice of areas to investigate should be carefully considered and justified concerning their importance and significance.

# General Guidance:

* Citations and references should be provided using the Harvard style.
* Charts, diagrams, and figures may all be used wherever appropriate to the points being made.
* A title page, executive summary and table of contents should all be provided (not included in the word count).
* Non-essential material that helps to inform the analysis may be submitted in appendices (not included in the word count).
* Please submit to Turnitin via Moodle using a Word file.

**Marking Criteria – Sustainability Report**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***0% – 39%*** | ***40% – 49%*** | ***50% – 59%*** | ***60% – 69%*** | ***70% – 84%*** | ***85% – 100%*** |
| **Knowledge of concepts and contexts** | Very weak understanding, based on little or no research into the industry. Descriptions of concepts and context lack accuracy and relevance. The source of the material is very weak or non-existent.  | Generally weak understanding of core concepts, with weak research into industry. Some limited evidence of understanding concepts and relevance in use. The source of the material is weak. | Some understanding of core concepts is shown, also demonstrating some exploration of industry issues. Generally clear and coherent, limited in range and depth. The source of the material is moderate, providing some adequate support. | Competent understanding of core concepts shown, along with a good breadth and depth of investigation into details of the industry. Some critical reflection and consideration of alternatives are evident. The source of the material is good, providing strong support.  | Excellent understanding of core concepts shown coupled with extensive and insightful details on the industry. Wide-ranging and critical reflections strongly in evidence. The source of the material is excellent, providing very strong support. | Exceptional understanding of core concepts shown, together with comprehensive coverage of relevant industry details. The source of the material is extremely well chosen throughout. |
| **Analysis** | There is no or very little evaluation or analysis; the work is almost entirely descriptive. | Very limited evidence of the ability to apply concepts and tools in analysis appropriately and meaningfully. The analysis is largely descriptive and there is a little developed argument.  | Key concepts are used to structure and develop analysis, though this is limited in the range and depth of issues being considered. A reasonable attempt is made at developing a coherent argument. | Uses key concepts effectively to generate robust and well-focused insights into context, leading to a coherent analysis. Some evidence of further critical reflection and evaluation.  | Key concepts are used very effectively and these are complemented with clearly supported independent judgement, original insights and critical reflections. The overall argument is coherent and wide-ranging. | There is a sophisticated use of core concepts, combining insightful analysis with well-supported critical reflection and generation of original ideas. The argument is comprehensive and compelling.  |
| **Communication** | Lacking clarity in delivery. Frequently difficult to understand or follow the argument. Weak structure and over/under length. Numerous instances of errors in the quality of presentation including spelling, grammar, legibility and referencing.  | Basic delivery, acceptable overall but with some confusion and lack of clarity. There are noticeable errors in the quality of the presentation including spelling, grammar, legibility and referencing. | Provides a fair level of clarity, occasionally lacking in coherence. Generally appropriate in length and focus. Limited errors in spelling, grammar, legibility and referencing. Quality overall is standard.  | Provides a good level of clarity, only minor aspects may lack some coherence. Good attention to length and focus, there are only occasional errors in spelling, grammar, legibility and referencing. Quality shows some originality and careful attention to detail.  | Provides an excellent level of clarity, covering complex issues very clearly. No noticeable errors in spelling, grammar, legibility and referencing. Arguments are coherent and well-focused throughout, and the quality shows professionalism and originality.  | Provides an outstanding level of clarity, without errors of any kind. Complex issues are succinctly covered and the presentation provides a comprehensive and compelling exploration of core issues. The style is exciting and engaging throughout. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |