**Assessment Task 1: Leadership Development Report**

**This assessment task is a REPORT.**

This requires you to use a particular style of writing which involves both the way the report is structured and the way that you acknowledge other people’s ideas used in your work.

Your second step should be mastering the art of referencing. There are many styles of referencing in use in different disciplines and geographical locations.

**HARVARD REFERENCING is required.**

**Remember: this current assessment task is a REPORT not an ESSAY.**

**The critical thinking element**

We want you to be very comfortable with questioning everything you read and hear.

Anyone can remember facts and state other people’s views but a far more useful skill is to critically review what you read and hear and decide for yourself how reliable, accurate, applicable, contemporary, objective and fair it is.

In this report, your assessor will value the fact that you are able to see both benefits and deficiencies in a particular theory. Make sure you look through the critical thinking exercises in the course site to get a clear understanding of critical thinking!

**How many references should I cite?**

There is no right answer to this question because it all depends on what you write in your report. Some statements you make in your report will certainly need a reference to support them.

So, to determine how many references you need to cite, first (as described in the report writing tutorial) draw a mind map of ideas to go into your report and for each idea try to link it to a reference source.

**How will the report be marked?**

Your lecturers have already created a marking rubric that will be used to award you a mark out of 50 as the report comprises 50 of the overall 100 marks available in this course.

The rubric is reproduced over the page and will be used as a way of providing feedback to you on how you performed.

The most important thing about the rubric is that it DEFINES what you will be marked on. If you include additional material that is not mentioned in the rubric it will not attract any marks, if you forget to write about something listed in the rubric, you’ll lose marks.

So the rubric is like a “contract” between you and your lecturer. Following the rubric clearly is your best strategy for a good result

**THE TASK**

1. Explore the Central Michigan University competencies model (5 clusters eg. Self-Management, Leading others, Task management, Innovation and Social Responsibility)
2. Identify your current strengths and weaknesses as a leader (or potential leader) within the context of the CMU (eg. Create a clear vision of yourself in approx. 5-10 years time – only then will you be able to identify your strengths and weaknesses)
3. Review the leadership theories explored in this course and describe how they relate to you and your leadership development (again in the context of the CMU model eg. Blake and Mouton model grid)
4. Create a leadership development plan (\*Starting point – Action plan eg. For future job/ self-improving etc.)
5. Seek feedback on your plan from an established leader. This leader can be anyone you know who holds a leadership position in an organisation. (And be anyone even your father or mother)
6. Describe how you have incorporated this leader’s feedback into your plan (whether you agree with the advice given or not)
7. Describe how you will achieve the developments set out in your plan (eg. Volunteering to help out with people with disabilities etc.)
8. Describe how you will evaluate whether or not you have reached the level of development set out in your plan (Set a timeline/dateline and a goal – eg. I used to be late on 9 out of 10 times for appointments but after goal should be ON TIME 9 out of 10 times)

**Word limit**: 2000 words (not including your reference list or any appendices you may wish to attach)

**Due:** 12/9/13

Some important key points:

* Write in First Person’s Writing and this assignment includes reflection on the past and must follow up with clear vision!
* Do not explain theory and ‘waste’ words – just apply and use them to describe yourself
* Can use tables to explain plan – counts in the word count

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report Element** | **Marks available** | **Marks awarded**  | **notes** |
| You have included a clear description of - and justification for - for your leadership development plan components.You should include: |  |  |  |
| a | Explanation of your contextualisation of the CMU Model  | 5 |  | Did you utilise the whole model or did you focus on a subset of issues within the model? Why? |
| b | Diagnosis of your leadership strengths and weaknesses | 5 |  | How did you carry out this diagnosis? What information / journal article / other source will you cite in your report to support the diagnostic process? |
| c | Industry-specific issues (e.g. manufacturing industry vs financial consulting) | 5 |  | Considering the industry sector that you work in (or intend to work in) are there any issues that are either unique or especially important? |
| d | Person-specific issues (e.g. gender, age, culture) | 5 |  | Your personal characteristics are important in shaping your leadership development. What can you say, for example, about the impact of your gender or your age group or your cultural background or the country / culture in which you are likely the work? |
| e | Timeframe for plan (multi-staged? 2 years? 5 years?) | 5 |  | What time frames will you place on various aspects of your leadership development? How soon could you reasonably expect to achieve a leadership development goal?  |
| f | Plan evaluation approach(es ) | 5 |  | How will you know that you’ve achieved the goals set out in your leadership development plan? What kind(s) of data and information will inform this? |
| Your plan is supported by key theory and practice literature. This literature has been cited and formatted according to the RMIT Business Referencing Guide | 15 |  | Which ideas, theories and approaches in leadership have you incorporated into your plan? Which reputable source will you “cite” when discussing these? |
| There is clear evidence of input to leadership plan from an industry leader.*What did the leader suggest?**What did you change as a consequence of the leader’s advice?* | 5 |  | What did the industry leader have to say about your draft leadership development plan? How have you modified your draft as a consequence? (For example, if the leader you consulted said that your timeframe to achieve your leadership gaols was unrealistically short, did you then extend the timeframe top achieve these?) |
| Total marks for this assessment task | 50 |  |  |

Grading approach

High Distinction (HD) 80 – 100%
Distinction (DI) 70 – 79%
Credit (CR) 60 – 69%
Pass (PA) 50 – 59%
Fail (NN) 0 – 49%

## **Attainment Standards for assessment Levels**

## **Fail 0 – 29%**

* Flawed work with little demonstrable understanding of the subject area. Inadequate in terms of knowledge, understanding, evidence and argument, this is vague and incomplete. Work shows evidence of only minimal reading.
* Rudimentary acquaintance with relevant materials and almost no understanding of the issues. Very poor to non-existent argument, evidence or illustration.
* Unstructured answers including frequent factual or serious factual errors.
* Unable to demonstrate even elementary knowledge and understanding of the topic with little evidence of reading to support the work and/or lacking appropriate support from the relevant literature.
* In respect of reflexive statements - student provides an incomplete or inaccurate description of the module task. In addition the student provides no or little insight into his or her own learning preferences and approaches.
* Work may additionally be failed for non-submission, academic misconduct, answering a different question from the one asked, consistently poor or incoherent writing, inappropriate vocabulary or not meeting the other requirements for an ordinary pass as described below.

**Fail 30-49%**

* For a piece of work to score in the 30-49 range the work would need to be considered ‘basic’ i.e. understanding and knowledge are elementary and sometimes in error.
* Work awarded this level of mark is often also very slim, off the point of the question, badly argued and presented and lacking in supporting evidence or illustration. Summaries of the relevant literature are sketchy and incomplete. There is little in the way of evidence or illustration, and what there is does not provide grounds for the candidate to make a persuasive case. An inability to draw relevant conclusions.
* In respect of reflexive statements - student provides a basic description of the module task with no insight into their own, or other’s, behaviour e.g. “I did this”. In addition the student demonstrates limited insight into his or her own habitual learning preferences and approaches.
* Case studies, when presented, are often badly suited to the subject of study.
* Work submitted demonstrates a poor grasp of the required scholarly standards in relation to presentation, required level of knowledge for the module level, errors, bad spelling or grammar, lack of organisation, assertions with insufficient arguments, late submission etc

**Pass 50 –59%**

* Satisfactory work. The topic is covered satisfactorily but not with the breadth or in the detail found in the Credit or Distinction range.
* There is reasonable coverage of the positions apparent in the relevant literature but the student does not examine this material in great depth or with great insight.
* A descriptive, rather than carefully argued, style of writing. Much of the weight of the work is carried by summaries of the existing literature.
* The student can go beyond answering the easiest questions and has some grasp of the more difficult material in the course.
* Argument is less acutely developed, and the use of evidence and illustration, while clear, is somewhat limited. Conclusions are limited in scope.

**Credit 60 – 69%**

* Good work. It is clear that the student understands the subject matter and has read widely in relation to it. The reading has been of sufficient breadth and depth for the student to master the material.
* Well-developed critical arguments and appropriate use of terminology.
* The answer displays considerable competence in developing an argument and the student is able to evaluate and synthesise the various cases made within the established literature. Work is characterised by coherent arguments supported by evidence from the work of other authorities or by direct empirical analysis rather than being characterised by assertion based on prejudice and unreflective opinion.
* The work is clearly structured and the use of evidence, argument and illustration is clear and competent.
* The student is self-critical and able to identify weaknesses as well as strengths in his or her own work, whether it is an essay, an argument, a piece of software, a proof etc.
* In respect of reflexive statements - student provides a thoughtful commentary on the task and how they learn and interact with others and the effect this has on the completion of the task, their own learning and relationships, combined with evidence of an ability to critically evaluate relevant theories of learning or groupwork in the light of the student’s own experience.
* The student is able to give clear, confident and interesting presentations on his or her work or the work of others, and to deal with questions and criticisms well.

## **Distinction (DI) 70 – 79%**

* Excellent work. In addition to possessing the features of the Credit level work in this marks range demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of the subject matter.
* Material is deployed in a disciplined way and the student has a sophisticated awareness of significant issues of debate in the area. In addressing the question the student shows that s/he is able to use this knowledge and awareness to develop independent thinking.
* The work is clearly structured and convincingly supported by appropriate evidence, argument or illustration.
* In respect of reflexive statements - student presents a thoughtful commentary on the task. This includes not only insights into how the student learns and interacts with others and the effect this has on the success of the task but also their own learning and development. In addition the student is able to critically evaluate and critique relevant theories of learning *and* be able to reflect on their own role in the reproduction of current management practice and theory.
* Work in the 70-79% range is normally evidence of extremely solid, thorough, comprehensive written work, i.e. the result of consistent hard work, though without very great originality.

**High Distinction (HD) 80 – 100%**

* In addition to possessing the features of the Distinction level work in the 80-89% range is normally evidence of original work, defined as where a student has identified new or unsolved problems or where the student has been able to make sophisticated distinctions in their analysis, drawing inferences, identifying flaws in published work, and developing new themes.
* Work in the higher range of marks is of a standard that could not conceivably be improved upon given the experience level of the student and the conditions under which the assessment was conducted.
* Work in the 90-99% range is normally characterised by work approaching the quality of published academic texts.