

**NEBOSH National Diploma in
Occupational Health and Safety
and
NEBOSH International Diploma in
Occupational Health and Safety**



UNIT DNI

**Assignment
Guidance and information for candidates**

This document provides comprehensive guidance on the presentation and submission of the Unit DNI assignment. Candidates should study this document carefully before submitting their assignment.



1 Purpose and aim

Unit DNI is a combined Unit for both the National Diploma in Occupational Health and Safety and the International Diploma in Occupational Health and Safety. The purpose of this Unit is for candidates to complete an assignment that will assess the practical application of the knowledge and understanding gained from their studies of Units A/IA, B/IB and C/IC of the National/International Diploma in Occupational Health and Safety syllabus in a vocational setting.

The aim of the assignment is for candidates to carry out a review of the arrangements for managing health and safety in a workplace and to produce justified, proportionate recommendations to improve health and safety performance.

Candidates will be required to demonstrate their understanding of the role of a health and safety practitioner and the adoption of a proportionate response to risk.

2 Syllabus content

Unit DNI contains no additional syllabus content. However, completion of study for Units A/IA, B/IB and C/IC is recommended in order to undertake the Unit DNI assignment. Accredited course providers and candidates are reminded that Element A11 of Unit A and Element IA9 of Unit IA will only be assessed in Unit DNI.

3 Assignment brief

The candidate is required to carry out a review of the arrangements for managing health and safety in a workplace and to produce justified, proportionate recommendations to improve health and safety performance.

The assignment will require the candidate to apply the knowledge and understanding gained from their studies of elements of Units A/IA, B/IB and C/IC in a real working environment and to carry out critical analysis and evaluation of information gathered during the review. The level of work should be that expected of a competent health and safety practitioner working within an organisation.

The assignment should include the following:

- An executive summary.
- An introduction that sets the scene by stating clear aims and objectives and a description of the methodology used to carry out the assignment. The introduction should also include a description of the chosen workplace and the role of the health and safety practitioner to set a context for the assignment.
- A review and critical analysis of arrangement for managing health and safety by the organisation. The candidate will review the following areas: leadership, management, worker involvement, competence, compliance and risk profile.
- An evaluation to identify the top three priorities where improvements should be made.
- Conclusions that summarise the main issues identified and lead to justified, proportionate, recommendations based on the outcome of the review.
- Bibliography and referencing.
- Appendices.

4 Assessment location

The Unit DNI assignment must be carried out in the candidate's own workplace. Where the candidate does not have access to a suitable workplace, the accredited course provider should be consulted to help in making arrangements for the candidate to carry out the assignment at suitable premises.

It is important that a suitable workplace is chosen. The workplace should be large enough to provide the opportunity to meet the requirements of the assignment brief. If the organisation is very large, in order that the assignment is manageable, the candidate should limit the area considered. In such circumstances it might be more appropriate to consider a department or division of the organisation rather than the organisation as a whole, although obviously, the health and safety management system will probably be that adopted by the whole organisation.

Candidates do not require supervision when carrying out the assignment.

The assessment is designed to reflect the role carried out by a competent health and safety practitioner. The candidate and their employer may find the outcome of the review useful in helping to identify future health and safety priorities. Candidates and employers should be aware that the status of the assignment carried out to fulfil the requirements of Unit DNI is for educational purposes only. It does not constitute an assessment for the purposes of any legislation, regulations, or standards.

Names of persons and organisations referred to in the assignment can be changed for confidentiality reasons. However, the organisation that forms the subject of the assignment should be 'real' in all other respects. Where the organisation name and/or names of company officers have been changed, the candidate should add the following disclaimer on the front page of the report: ***'Note: The organisation and/or officers' names included in this report are fictitious but the report is based on a real organisation/workplace'***.

Fictitious workplaces or simulated scenarios are not acceptable.

5 Submission of completed work

Assignments should be submitted before the set submission date; there are four submission dates each year in February, May, August and November. Late submissions will not be accepted and candidates should plan for the completion and submission of the assignment in sufficient time to meet the submission deadline date.

The actual dates will be published by NEBOSH annually. Candidates intending to submit an assignment must register through their accredited course provider using the appropriate form and paying the appropriate fee. No refund of fees will be made in cases where candidates register but fail to submit.

Following registration candidates will receive a pre-submission email which confirms their registration and includes instructions for electronic submission of their assignment.

Assignments must be submitted electronically directly to NEBOSH. Candidates should ensure that their accredited course provider's name/number is not shown anywhere in the assignment. Candidates should include their NEBOSH student number on each page of their assignment.

Candidates are strongly advised to keep a copy of their assignment.

Assignments must be the candidate's original work. Assignments will be submitted by NEBOSH to the Turnitin UK text-matching service and added to the Turnitin database. Cases of plagiarism or collusion will be dealt with severely and are liable to result in the assignment being disqualified and the candidate being banned from future registrations. Any candidate who provides an opportunity for another candidate to use his/her assignment inappropriately shall be liable to the same sanction.

After the completion of the marking process candidates will be informed of the total mark for their submission and the marks for each section.

Candidates must achieve a pass standard of **50%** in the assignment in order to satisfy the assessment criteria for the award of National Diploma or International Diploma.

If a candidate is referred they can register to resubmit the assignment at a later submission date; however, this must be within a five-year period (the five-years starts from the declaration date of the first successful unit). Please refer to the Guide for the qualification for further information.

6 Tutor support

Candidates should ensure that they understand fully the requirements of the brief and are recommended to prepare an outline plan of their approach that can be discussed with a tutor. While it would not be appropriate for tutors to read and amend drafts of the assignment, their role is to ensure that the candidate is 'heading in the right direction'– for example, they may comment on whether the candidate has chosen a suitable workplace or situation that satisfies the brief and will give sufficient scope to achieve the necessary breadth and depth of content required at Diploma level. Tutors must not provide a 'pre- mark'.

7 Marking

The Unit DNI assignment is marked by appropriately qualified Examiners appointed by NEBOSH. Candidates must achieve the pass standard (50%) in Unit DNI in order to satisfy the criteria for the qualification.

8 Structure of the assignment

8.1 General

A good assignment is planned well from the outset. Candidates should read the brief and the detailed guidance carefully to make sure it is understood what is required. An outline plan that includes the main headings and the topics required in each part should be produced. This can be used as a checklist to make sure that everything has been included when the assignment is proof read at the end.

The assignment should be organised in sections that match those set out in the mark scheme and contain a contents page. To help the reader, each section should be headed with the appropriate title. The sections are:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
- Review and critical analysis of arrangements for managing health and safety
- Evaluation of improvements required
- Conclusions and Recommendations

- Bibliography
- Appendices.

The assignment should be approximately 8,000 words in total, excluding the list of contents, bibliography and appendices. No penalty will be applied to assignments that exceed 8,000 words but candidates should aim to keep their word count under 12,000 to avoid the main requirements of the brief becoming lost and the assignment losing clarity. Candidates should also note that irrelevant material included in their assignments will not attract marks.

Appendices should only be included if they support the content of the assignment. The candidate should include only material that is an essential aid to an understanding of the content of the assignment. Each appendix should be referred to in the assignment so that the reader can turn directly to it to find the background to the factor concerned. Appendices should be kept to the minimum. The reader is not going to spend time reading through a collection of items that may not be relevant.

8.2 Preparation

Candidates should make initial preparations for the assignment, including obtaining formal agreement from the managers responsible for their chosen area and advising them of the requirements of the review. Convenient dates for the assignment work should be agreed well in advance. Any restrictions likely to affect the assignment should be identified in advance.

A common problem is that of confidentiality. Please refer to Section 4 for further information.

Candidates should be aware of any risks to their own health and safety associated with the assignment work. Guidance should be sought from the management at the site to ensure that appropriate precautions are taken to avoid or minimise any risks.

8.3 Focus and presentation

The assignment should have a clear and ethically acceptable focus that satisfies the brief and associated guidance. In each section of the assignment marks are awarded both for the range of factors considered and the quality of treatment, therefore candidates need to achieve a balance between range and depth. Given the level of the Diploma, a large range of factors treated superficially will not be sufficient to gain a high mark for a particular section.

The assignment should follow a logical structure and convey the information as concisely as possible. However, sets of bullet points are unlikely to give sufficient indication that the candidate has a firm understanding of the subject matter.

The assignment should be easy to read and use clear language. The structure of the assignment helps this. A good style is also essential and candidates should structure their assignment into paragraphs and avoid large blocks of text. Candidates should try to avoid jargon that is specific to one sort of organisation such as the armed forces or health service, for example. Sentences should be kept relatively short and to the point. A good rule is 'one subject one sentence'. Candidates should check grammar and spelling and should not use abbreviations without writing them first in full.

The assignment should include appropriate use and range of presentational devices, eg tables, figures and appendices. Text should have the appropriate choice of font size and line spacing. Font size should be a minimum of 11 to facilitate reading. Please note that a specific font, spacing and maximum length is required for the executive summary (see Section 8.4.1).

References must be cited correctly using a recognised system such as Vancouver or Harvard.

Checking the accuracy of references to international standards, legislation, Approved Codes of Practice (ACOPs) etc is important as there is no excuse for inaccurate citation in an assignment at this level.

8.4 Completion of the report to top management

8.4.1 Executive Summary

The executive summary should be written after the candidate has completed the rest of the report but it should be inserted at the beginning of the report. Candidates need to deliver key information with a persuasive, well-substantiated pitch that avoids jargon and includes a summary of the conclusions and recommendations. Candidates need to establish key issues that needs solving and describe the measurable impact on performance in order to capture and maintain the reader's attention and thereby prompt a response and support that is positive.

The candidate needs to provide a convincing case for solving the key issues, recommending proportionate and sensible solutions and a corresponding benefit to the reader. This should be written with a moral, legal, and economic persuasiveness.

An executive summary should provide sufficient information to enable a busy senior manager to make a decision as to whether or not to read the full report and to provide a persuasive case for implementation of recommendations made. The executive summary should be no longer than one side of A4 using single-spaced Arial font (size 11) and 2cm print margins (left, right, top and bottom).

8.4.2 Introduction

The introduction provides a foundation for the assignment and enables the reader to place the following information and judgements in context. A well written assignment will have clear, stated aims and objectives. The aims should be a statement of intent, in broad terms, outlining aspirations of what the candidate hopes to achieve at the end of the assignment. Objectives should be specific statements, defining measurable outcomes, of how the candidate intends to achieve the aims. Referring the conclusions back to these aims and objectives will help the reader to decide how well the assignment has achieved them. Candidates need to refer to aims and objectives that relate to the organisation and not a reiteration of the assignment brief.

The methodology employed should describe methods used to research and develop the assignment. The candidate should give a brief overview of the methodology used to research and develop the assignment. Candidates should describe methodologies such as literary reviews, existing research data, case studies, surveys, questionnaires and interviews and development of the assignment through subsequent analysis and presentation of data such as comparative tables, graphical illustrations, Excel spreadsheets, etc. This provides the reader with evidence that the work has been carried out in a rigorous manner and that the findings are therefore to be relied upon.

A description of the chosen workplace/organisation is needed to set the context for the assignment. This should include the size of the organisation, the nature of work carried out, and what processes are carried out, the employment profile, the work patterns and production schedules employed. If a department or site has been chosen in a very large organisation, its relationship to the work of the organisation should also be included. The description should also include the current arrangements for competent health and safety advice.

The role of the candidate, as a health and safety practitioner, in setting and achieving the objectives of the organisation should be explained. Any potential ethical, or other, conflicts that this role brings in terms of protecting employers, employees and third parties should also

be identified.

The meaning of the term 'ethics' should be set into context with the ethical principles (honesty, respect, integrity) that the health and safety practitioner should apply when carrying out the work required for this assignment.

8.4.3 Review and critical analysis of the arrangements for managing health and safety

The critical analysis needs to establish 'Where are you now?' and requires a review based on rigorous enquiry of the current arrangements for health and safety under the core elements of:

- leadership;
- management;
- worker involvement;
- competence;
- compliance;
- risk profile (which should focus on significant risks and critical control measures).

For each element the current arrangements should be identified, evidenced and critically analysed against best practice to identify gaps in the current arrangements. Examples of areas to be included in each element are provided below. The examples provided are not a definitive list and some may not be relevant to all organisations.

Leadership

- Is there health and safety leadership from the top of the organisation? Is it visible?
- Is there a health and safety champion/focus at board level?
- Is there health and safety leadership at all levels within the organisation? Is it visible?
- What examples do leaders set? Do they talk about health and safety? When was this last done?
- Is the leadership aware of the organisation's significant risks and how well they are being controlled?
- Are the health and safety implications of business decisions recognised and addressed?
- Is there evidence that the board or leader of the organisation is responsive to the health and safety information that is reported?

Management

- How is health and safety included in the management arrangements for the organisation?
- Are the health and safety responsibilities of key people clear and reflected in job descriptions? Is there setting of policy and performance standards?
- Is there performance monitoring?
- Is there access to competent advice?
- Is there adequate provision/communication of current health and safety information/documentation?
- Is there adequate control of third parties, including contractors?
- Are health and safety performance reviews carried out?

Worker involvement

- How are workers or their representatives consulted and involved in health and safety matters?
- How effective are those mechanisms?
- Are the needs of any vulnerable workers being met?
- Are workers consulted in good time?
- Do health and safety representatives have sufficient time and access to the facilities they need to carry out their functions?

Competency

- Are the health and safety responsibilities of managers/supervisors proven to be effective?
- Who fulfils the role of the health and safety competent person and are they effective?
- Does the organisation act upon advice from the competent person?
- Is there an identified lack of competence in a particular area?
- How are workers selected for tasks carried out?
- Are arrangements in place to ensure workers are aware of roles and responsibilities?
- How are training needs identified?
- Do contractors have an appropriate induction and training?
- Is there enough competent cover for absences?

Compliance

- Is the organisation aware of all of the relevant compliance requirements affecting its undertaking? This is not just restricted to legal, eg local legislation requirements, but may also extend to other defined standards, eg ISO OHSAS18001; company standards, eg internal procedures; external requirements, eg insurance or customer stipulations.
- Can the organisation demonstrate that it is compliant with all requirements?

Risk profile

- What is the nature of the significant risks faced by the organisation?
- What is the likelihood of adverse effects occurring and the level of disruption?
- Is there evidence that critical health and safety risks are included in the overall business risk management of the organisation?
- Is there evidence that all of the critical risks have been identified within organisational risk profiling and the level of risk assessed effectively?
- Is there evidence that critical controls have been identified and implemented effectively, or a plan in place to implement these controls based on defined priorities?
- Is there evidence that risks are being managed proportionality and sensibly?
- Is there evidence of assessment of risks/risk assessments including the identification of persons affected, including vulnerable workers?
- Is there evidence of active/reactive monitoring of critical control from risk assessment?
- Is there evidence of review of risk assessments at appropriate intervals based on established risk level?
- What is the health and safety practitioner's role in enabling work activities as part of proportionate and sensible risk management?

It is important that this section of the assignment includes a critical analysis of the current health and safety arrangements, not just a description. This means comparing the current arrangements with identified criteria or standards and making a judgement on whether or not the current arrangements are acceptable or not. Where arrangements meet or exceed the relevant criteria then this should be stated.

8.4.4 Evaluation of improvements required

On completion of the review and critical analysis the information about the current arrangements should be evaluated to determine the **top three** improvements that would make the most impact on improving health and safety performance at the organisation.

The improvements can be selected from any of the elements and candidates can select all three improvements from one element eg risk profile, from two elements eg leadership and risk profile, or from three separate elements eg leadership, worker involvement and risk profile. Candidates need to justify their choice on the basis of the critical analysis but the key issue is that these are deemed to be the issues that if addressed will have the largest impact. These recommendations should be evaluated as being both proportionate and sensible.

For each improvement candidates need to go on to explain how the improvement will actually be achieved. Consideration should be given to the following factors:

- Who will be responsible for implementing the improvements?
- What resources are required? This might include internal costs in terms of time required and potentially external spend.
- Is any training required?
- What are the timescales for improvements?
- How will the effectiveness of the improvements be measured, monitored and reported?
- How will lessons be learnt?
- How will any ethical or other conflicts be addressed?

8.4.5 Role of the health and safety practitioner

Candidates are required to explain their role as a health and safety practitioner in implementing the improvements, eg mentoring and supporting the development of competency in other employees. This should include an explanation of the distinction between leadership and management and the use of different management styles to help achieve the improvement selected. The importance of recognising the limits of personal competence should be explained and if there are any aspects of the proposed improvements that require specialist input. The contribution of the critical analysis and evaluation to the candidate's own personal development should be explained.

8.4.6 Effective communication of improvements

This section should explain the use of different methods of communication media to promote the improvements. Candidates should explain they will influence ownership of the improvement via participation, management accountability, consultation, negotiation and feedback. The need for any conflict/change management should also be included and how roles and responsibilities will be clearly communicated to workers to ensure they are understood and implemented.

8.4.7 Financial justification

The financial justification for each selected improvement should be outlined by identifying who is responsible for the required budget and carrying out a cost-benefit analysis (CBA) using relevant internal and external sources of information. The CBA should identify the types of, and indicative, realistic costs likely to be incurred. Candidates should determine how the budget holder can be influenced to make appropriate health and safety decisions. The cost-benefit analysis should include an estimate of the total implementation cost for each improvement and the ongoing costs. Benefits should be given and quantified and costed where possible. Gains, such as reduced accidents and/or ill-health and process efficiency, should be outlined and payback periods identified. This should result in a comparison of the costs against the stated benefits. This financial justification must link to the judgement of whether recommendations are both proportionate and sensible.

8.4.8 Conclusions and Recommendations

Candidates are required to provide a concise summary of the findings identified in the main body of assignment. The conclusions should not introduce new issues or additional relevant factors.

The conclusions should start by referring back to the aims, objectives and scope of the assignment through a brief discussion of how well they were achieved. The conclusions should follow on logically from the main body.

The recommendations should follow logically from the conclusions and be based on the three selected improvements in the evaluation section of the main body. For each recommendation the candidate should provide justification for its inclusion and ensure the argument is convincing in order to encourage top management to take the required action. It is appreciated that the candidate will probably identify more than three areas for improvement and these can be included within the conclusions and recommendations section. However, only the top three improvements will be marked.

8.4.9 Bibliography and referencing

Where candidates have carried out research, this should be shown through referencing and the bibliography. The body of the report to top management should reference these sources in the appropriate place. It is no use putting in a lot of references if you have not read them. There are established conventions for referencing. The two most common methods used in reports are the Harvard system and the Vancouver system. An explanation of these referencing systems can be found on the internet.

9 Marking criteria

Each section of the assignment has a maximum mark available (please refer to the numbered section indicated for a breakdown of the performance marking):

9.1.1	Focus and presentation	5
9.1.2	Executive Summary	10
9.1.3	Introduction	5
9.1.4	Review and critical analysis of the arrangements for managing health and safety	40
9.1.5	Evaluation of improvements required	30
9.1.6	Conclusions and recommendations	10
	Total	100

9.1 Level Descriptors

9.1.1 Focus and presentation (5 marks)

Level 1 (4-5)

The assignment has a clear and ethically acceptable focus that satisfies the assignment brief. The assignment follows a logical structure and conveys the information concisely using clear language and the structure reference in Section 3. References are cited correctly using a recognised system. The executive summary covers no more than one side of A4 using the page set up as detailed in Section 8.4.1.

Level 2 (2-3)

The assignment is generally clear and ethically focused but does not satisfy all aspects of the brief and guidance. The assignment is generally logical and concise and the language and presentational devices, eg tables, figures and appendices are mostly clear but there is a lack of structure (reference to Section 3) in some areas. References are generally cited correctly. The executive summary covers no more than one side of A4 using the page set up as detailed in Section 8.4.1.

Level 3 (0-1)

The assignment is unclear and unfocused and does not satisfy the assignment brief. The assignment is not logically structured (reference to Section 3) or concise and the language is unclear and unstructured. There is no/inappropriate use and range of presentational devices, eg tables, figures and appendices. References are limited or cited incorrectly. The executive summary covers more than one side of A4 and/or the page set up detailed in Section 8.4.1 has not been followed.

9.1.2 Executive summary (10 marks)

Level 1 (8-10)

The conclusions and recommendations are summarised. There is reference to problems that needs resolving with a convincing case for resolving the problems that is morally, legally and financially persuasive. There is a description of a measurable impact on performance that captures the reader's attention. Solutions to the identified problems are proportionate and sensible.

Level 2 (4-7)

The conclusions and recommendations referenced but not adequately summarised. Problems that need resolving are not adequately established and the case for resolving the problems does not cover the moral, legal and financial aspects. The measurable impact on performance to capture reader's attention is not fully described. Solutions to the identified problems are partially proportionate and sensible.

Level 3 (0-3)

The conclusions and recommendations are not summarised. There is no/limited reference to the problems that need resolving. The measurable impact on performance is limited/not included. The recommended solutions to the identified problems are not proportionate and sensible. The case for resolving the problem is not convincing or morally, legally and financially persuasive.

9.1.3 Introduction (5 marks)**Level 1 (4-5)**

Aims and objectives are clearly stated and there is a description of the methodology used to carry out the assignment. There is a description of the chosen workplace and the role of the health and safety practitioner in achieving the objectives of the organisation is included. The meaning and application of ethical principles is addressed.

Level 2 (2-3)

The aims and objectives are included but could be clearer and there is a reasonable description of the methodology used to carry out the assignment. There is a reasonable description of the chosen workplace but the role of the health and safety practitioner in achieving the objectives of the organisation could be clearer. The meaning and application of ethical principles are included but could be clearer.

Level 3 (0-1)

The aims and objectives are unclear. There is limited/no description of the methodology used to carry out the assignment. There is limited/no description of the chosen workplace or the role of health and safety practitioner in achieving the objectives of the organisation. There is limited/no meaning and application of ethical principles.

9.1.4 Review and critical analysis of arrangements for managing health and safety (40 marks)

The elements leadership, management, worker involvement, competence and compliance all have a maximum of 5 marks available and will be assessed against the following levels:

Level 1 (4-5)

The account demonstrates a detailed and accurate understanding of the principal concepts involved. The information presented is relevant and is substantiated by a range of good evidence and provides comprehensive coverage of the situation. The relationship between the information and the evidence is clearly expressed. The review is based on rigorous enquiry and the candidate has analysed the evidence against a recognised standard. The current arrangements are critically analysed against best practice demonstrating research and analytical skills. There is reference to good practice.

Level 2 (2-3)

There is an understanding of the area reviewed. Some of the information presented is relevant and there is some substantiating evidence. The relationship between the information and the evidence is given in some areas. The candidate has attempted to base the review on enquiry and has attempted to analyse the evidence against a recognised standard. There is some evidence that the candidate has demonstrated research and analytical skills.

Level 3 (0-1)

There is little or no understanding of the area reviewed. Much of the information presented is irrelevant and there is very little or no substantiating evidence. There is little or no relationship between the information and the evidence. The candidate has not attempted to base the review on enquiry and has done little or no analysis of the evidence against a recognised standard. There is little or no evidence that the candidate has demonstrated research and analytical skills.

The element 'risk profile' has a maximum of 15 marks available and will be assessed against the following levels:

Level 1 (11-15)

There is a detailed and accurate understanding of the area to be reviewed. The information presented is relevant and is substantiated by a range of good evidence. The relationship between the information and the evidence is clearly expressed. The review is based on rigorous enquiry and the candidate has analysed the evidence against a recognised standard. The evidence has been critically analysed and research and analytical skills have been demonstrated.

Level 2 (5-10)

There is an understanding of the area to be reviewed but the review in some areas is lacking. Some of the information presented is relevant and there is some substantiating evidence. The relationship between the information and the evidence is given in some areas. The candidate has attempted to base the review on enquiry and has attempted to analyse the evidence against a recognised standard. There is some evidence that the candidate has demonstrated research and analytical skills.

Level 3 (0-4)

There is little or no understanding of the area reviewed. Much of the information presented is irrelevant and there is very little or no substantiating evidence. There is little or no relationship between the information and the evidence. The candidate has not attempted to base the review on enquiry and has done little or no analysis of the evidence against a recognised standard. There is little or no evidence that the candidate has demonstrated research and analytical skills.

9.1.5 Evaluation of improvements required (30 marks)

Each selected improvement will have a maximum of 10 marks available and will be assessed against the following levels:

Level 1 (8-10)

The improvement selected is appropriate and justified and at least one opportunity for the improvement has been given. There is an explanation of how the improvement will be achieved including responsibilities, resources, training requirements, timescales and measuring and monitoring of the effectiveness of the improvement/s. There is a detailed, realistic cost benefit analysis included for the improvement.

Level 2 (4-7)

The improvement selected is reasonable and partially justified and some opportunities for the improvement have been given. There is some explanation of how the improvement will be achieved under responsibilities, resources, training requirements, timescales and measuring and monitoring of the effectiveness of the improvement/s. There is a simple cost benefit analysis included for the improvement.

Level 3 (0-3)

The improvement selected has limited/no justification and no relevant opportunities have been identified. There is limited/no explanation of how the improvement will be achieved under responsibilities, resources, training requirements, timescales and measuring and monitoring of the effectiveness of the improvement/s. There is either an unrealistic or no cost benefit analysis included.

9.1.6 Conclusions and recommendations (10 marks)**Level 1 (7-10)**

The conclusion references the aims, objectives and scope of the assignment. There is a concise summary of the main findings and no introduction of any new issues or factors. Justified recommendations are made and a convincing argument made for implementing the three selected improvements.

Level 2 (4-6)

The conclusion references some of the aims, objectives and scope of the assignment. There is a reasonable summary of the main findings with limited or no introduction of new issues and factors. Recommendations are made based on the three selected improvements and there is some justification and argument for implementing the three selected improvements.

Level 3 (0-3)

The conclusion gives limited or no reference to the aims, objectives and scope of the assignment. The main findings are not summarised and there are new issues and factors introduced. There is limited/no reference to justified recommendations and no convincing argument for implementing the three selected improvements.