

The Chartered Membership Programme Marking Descriptors



*Please note that the bands below describe indicative characteristics only. An overall holistic approach is required when assessing a candidate's work and assigning a grade.

Total Marks available 120. Pass mark 60 (50%). Each module must be passed. Pass mark for a module is 15.

Task Achievement The Relevance of the Response	Inclusion of Relevant Technical Knowledge in Content	Presentation/Coherence
Distinction – 26 and above		
The work demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the task. All relevant information is included. The main issues are effectively identified and analysed. There is evaluation and analysis of solutions to issues relevant to the task. The response shows control of content within the word count.	The work demonstrates a strong understanding of a wide range of technical and managerial issues relevant to the task. There is identification of the most important of these in terms of risk. There is analysis of the advantages/disadvantages of possible choices and potential outcomes.	The work is appropriately structured and the argument is developed coherently. There is a recognised form of source referencing which supports the points in the task. Paragraphing and titling are used effectively to assist the reader. The use of visual/graphical information is clear and effective in assisting the reader. The graphical information is relevant to the task and accurate.
Merit – 21 - 25		
The work demonstrates a clear understanding of the main issues relevant to the task. The issues are explained effectively and potential solutions identified. There is some attempt to analyse the merits of the solutions to the task. The task is broadly achieved within the word count if relevant to assignment.	The work demonstrates an understanding of the key technical and managerial issues of the task. There is clear description of relevant technical aspects with some attempt to evaluate the merits of these to the task.	Demonstrates an awareness of presentation and an attempt to present the information with clarity and coherence. There is referencing of sources and use of paragraphing and titling to assist the reader. There is use of clear graphical information to support the assignment which has broad relevance to the task. There may be some inaccuracies/omissions in these.
Pass – 15 - 20		
The work demonstrates some understanding of the task. Most aspects of the task are achieved. The main points are identified. There may be some inaccuracies, omissions and irrelevant content. There may be some shortfall or lack of control in relation to the word count.	The work demonstrates an understanding of the main technical issues which are identified. This may be limited to description with little evidence of evaluation. There may be some omissions and inaccuracies in the detail. There may be some irrelevant details.	There is an attempt to structure the information. There is evidence of paragraphing and titling which is not always appropriate. Some basic graphical information may be included which is of some assistance to the reader. There may be some omissions or inaccuracies. The work is generally coherent but there may be occasional lapses in coherence and structure.
Referral – 14 or less		
The work shows a poor understanding of the task. Frequent inaccuracies. Failure to identify important aspects of the task. Much of the information is irrelevant to the task. There may be evidence of copy and paste from external sources. The response may be limited to lists of words with no attempt to explain the relevance/merits of these to the task. The assignment falls short of the word count.	The work demonstrates a lack of understanding of the technical aspects. There are omissions of important technical information. Errors are evident in the technical content. There is no attempt to explain the relevance of the technical content to the task.	Lacks structure and may be limited to lists of points which are not developed Disorganised in structure causing difficulty for the reader to understand the points. The response is illegible or incoherent in places. No referencing of external sources. The graphical illustrations are of poor quality or absent. They may be irrelevant. There may be errors and a lack of clarity causing difficulty for the reader to understand.