

Mngt 1002 Essay Marking

Essay – Compare and contrast Entrepreneurship & Innovation	F	P	C	D	HD
Identification and discussion of definitions of entrepreneurship and Innovation (2 marks)					
Comparison and contrasting of benefits of entrepreneurship and innovation (3 marks)					
Comparison and contrasting of detriments of entrepreneurship and innovation (3 marks)					
Discussion of economic and social implications for entrepreneurship and innovation (2 marks)					
Coverage of relevant theoretical issues, including integration of relevant literature (academic and applied industry) (2 marks)					
Structure, including logic and reasoning (how well argued) (1 mark)					
Depth of research (academic and industry) (1 mark)					
Validity of argument development, including referencing style, spelling and grammar (1 mark)					

Comments:

MNGT1002 Introduction to Entrepreneurship and Innovation

Criteria	Fail	Pass	Credit	Distinction	High Distinction
Identification and discussion of definitions of entrepreneurship and innovation	Very narrowly researched minimal or no academic sources used	Narrow research, some validity using academic sources	Widely researched and discussed with multiple sources supporting the ideas/issues in the definitions	Very good research and discussion demonstrating the width and depth of academic sources used to support the presented definitions	Excellent validated definitions with concise and insightful discussion
Comparison and contrasting of benefits of entrepreneurship and innovation	Very poor or NO critical analysis. No comparative arguments. Discussion presents strong biases.	Poor critical and comparative analysis. Discussion presents some biases.	Good critical and comparative analysis with two-fold arguments presenting a balanced discussion	Very good critical and comparative analysis with strong two-fold arguments presenting a balanced discussion	Excellent formation of comparative argument, with quality validation
Comparison and contrasting of detriments of entrepreneurship and innovation	Very poor or NO critical analysis. No comparative arguments. Discussion presents strong biases.	Poor critical and comparative analysis. Discussion presents some biases.	Good critical and comparative analysis with two-fold arguments presenting a balanced discussion	Very good critical and comparative analysis with strong two-fold arguments presenting a balanced discussion	Excellent formation of comparative argument, with quality validation
Discussion of economic and social implications for entrepreneurship and innovation	Rudimentary logic with limited connection between ideas. OR Lack of logic random collection of ideas	Adequate logic, discussion and analyses of some issues.	Sound logic, discussion and analyses all issues.	Sound logic, discussion and superior analyses of all issues	Excellent logic, discussion and analyses of all issues
Coverage of relevant theoretical issues, including integration of relevant literature (academic and applied industry)	Very narrow discussion around theories and empirical issues to substantiate arguments and very poorly integrated OR Discussion limited to the textbook and course material with no empirical issues to substantiate arguments	Uses a variety of theories and empirical issues to substantiate arguments; however not well integrated OR Narrowly researched; but attempted to integrate theories and empirical issues	Uses a variety of well integrated theories and empirical issues to substantiate arguments	Uses a wide variety of well integrated theories and empirical issues to substantiate arguments	Displays excellent integration of academic and industry sources and breadth of relevant theoretical issues
Structure, including logic and reasoning (how well argued)	Poor to Rudimentary logic with limited connection between ideas. OR Lack of logic random collection of ideas	Adequate logic, discussion and analysis of some issues.	Sound logic, discussion and analyses all issues.	Sound logic, discussion and superior analyses of all issues	Excellent logic, discussion and analyses of all issues
Demonstrated depth of academic and applicable industry research	Very narrowly researched with hardly any academic sources used	Narrow research, but some quality academic sources have been used	Widely researched with multiple sources supporting the ideas/issues in the arguments	Very good research demonstrating the width and depth of academic sources used to support the presented discussion.	Excellent research demonstrating the width and depth of academic sources used to support the presented discussion.
Demonstrated validation of argument, including referencing style	Sentence structure and grammar inadequate for clarity and/or incomplete/incorrect referencing of sourced material.	Sentence structure and grammar adequate, but errors cause distraction and/or errors in referencing.	Sentence structure and grammar adequate, with minor errors that do not distract reader from the main message. Some incorrect referencing maybe present	Sentence structures and grammar are good with correct referencing of all sourced material.	Excellent validity of argument, displaying high standards of academic writing and referencing