University of HUDDERSFIELD
Inspiring global professionals

ASSESSMENT TASK Coursework substitute for exam

Module Code:	*BMT1017*
Module Title:	*Logistics Management*
Assessment Task(s)	*Coursework substitute for exam*
Academic Year	*2019 / 2020*

Learning Outcomes
This assessment task addresses the following learning outcomes from the module specification 1. Have a comprehensive understanding of the role and significance of the logistics function to companies and organisations. 2. Have critical awareness of the issues underpinning effective inventory control to maximise serviceability at minimum cost. 3. Have a systematic understanding of the requirement of an effective distribution network strategy 4. Critically evaluate the trade-offs between different storage and handling solutions. 5. Evaluate and apply various methods to determine appropriate stockholding requirements. 6. Critically evaluate the relative merits of competing warehouse design solutions and procedures. 7. Demonstrate various planning and industrial engineering techniques to assist with warehouse design and performance management.

Assessment brief
Compare the inventory system requirements for different grocery channels to market 100%

You are advised to:
• *Avoid description of the content of material referred to – critical evaluation is required where specified.* • *Work should be referenced in APA 6th style. The link below is to the library guidance on referencing and it is recommended you use these resources to ensure your references are in the correct format.* • http://www.hud.ac.uk/library/finding-info/informationskills/evaluation/referencing/ • *Read widely from textbooks, journals and authoritative commentaries in forming your views.* • *Refer back to your tutorial work and notes where you have covered key issues and developed critical argument that is relevant to the requirement of this assessment.*

- *Pay close attention to the Assessment Criteria at the end of this document – this lists general assessment criteria and specific criteria to the requirements of this assignment. These criteria will be used to inform your electronic feedback on your marked assignment.*
- *Use the University Referencing guide which is APA 6th. Note that poorly referenced material will lose you marks (make sure you consult the Learning Development Group Tutors on level 1 of the Business School for any additional help needed). You can access APA 6th via Brightspace by clicking on the Library button to access the easy to use online guide.*
- *Do not exceed the word limit. A 5% mark penalty applies for work exceeding the word limit.*

Marking criteria

1. Please refer to the assessment criteria in Appendix 1. These show you the issues that will guide your tutors in marking your work. You are encouraged to use these at all stages of preparing your work. Please remember that the marking process involves academic judgement and interpretation within the marking criteria.

2. The Learning Development Group are available to help you to understand and use the assessment criteria. To book an appointment, either visit them on The Street in the Charles Sikes Building or email them on busstudenthub@hud.ac.uk

3. The University has regulations relating to academic misconduct, including **plagiarism.** The Learning Development Group can also advise and help you about academic conventions and avoiding 'poor scholarship' which can result in potential academic misconduct.

Submission information *[Module leader should complete as appropriate]*

Word Limit:	3,000
Submission Date:	12 5 2020
Submission Time:	15.00
Submission Method:	Electronically via Brightspace. Papers submissions are not required. For support please contact
Tutor Reassessment	N/A
Notes:	

Please refer to the Module Handbook for Assessment Guidance in Section 5.

Appendix 1: Assessment Criteria

	0-9	10-19	20-34	35-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-100
Knowledge	Entirely lacking in evidence of knowledge and understanding.	Typically only able to deal with terminology, basic facts and concepts.	Knowledge of concepts falls short of prescribed range. Typically only able to deal with terminology, basic facts and concepts.	Display of knowledge is marginally insufficient. There is adequate knowledge of concepts within prescribed range but fails to adequately solve problems posed by assessment.	A systematic understanding of knowledge, demonstrating critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights. Critically evaluates current research and evaluates methodologies.	Approaching excellence in some areas with evidence of the potential to undertake research. Well-developed relevant argument, good degree of accuracy and technical competence.	Excellent display of knowledge. Demonstrates high levels of accuracy. Evidence of the potential to undertake research and analyse primary sources critically.	Insightful display of knowledge. Demonstrates excellent research potential and flexibility of thought. Possibly of publishable quality.	Striking and insightful display of knowledge of publishable quality. Demonstrates outstanding research potential, originality and independent thought. Ability to make informed judgements is evident.
Presentation	Length requirements may not be observed. Does not follow academic conventions. Language errors impact on intelligibility.	Length requirements may not be observed. Does not follow academic conventions. Language errors impact on intelligibility.	Length requirements may not be observed. Does not follow academic conventions. Language errors impact on intelligibility	Length requirement met and academic conventions mostly followed. Minor errors in language.	Length requirement met and academic conventions mostly followed. Possibly very minor errors in language.	Good standard of presentation. Length requirement met and academic conventions followed.	Very good standards of presentation.	Professional standards of presentation.	Highest professional standards of presentation.
Understanding	Limited insight into the problem or topic.	Limited insight into the problem or topic.	Limited insight into the problem or topic.	Some insight into the problem or topic.	Practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline.	Independent, critical evaluation of full range of theories with some evidence of originality.	Authoritative, full understanding of all the issues with originality in analysis.	Authoritative, full understanding of all the issues with originality in analysis leading to new insights.	Authoritative, full understanding of all the issues with originality in analysis leading to new and profound insights.

Selection and Coverage	Some irrelevant and/or out of date sources.	Some irrelevant and/or out of date Sources.	Some irrelevant and/or out of date Sources.	Limited sources.	Comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship.	Complex work and concepts presented with key texts used effectively.	Full range of sources used selectively to support argument.	Full range of sources used selectively to support and enhance argument.	Full range of sources used selectively and skilfully to support and enhance argument.
Structure	Argument not developed and may be confused and incoherent.	Argument not developed and may be confused and incoherent.	Argument not developed and may be confused and incoherent.	Argument not fully developed and may lack structure.	The argument is developed but may lack fluency.	Argument concise and Explicit.	Coherent and compelling argument which is well presented.	Coherent and compelling argument which is very well presented.	Coherent and compelling argument which is exceptionally well presented and persuasive.
Depth of Reflection	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalisation of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are missing, inappropriate, and/or unsupported. Examples, when applicable, are not provided.	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalisation of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are missing, inappropriate, and/or unsupported. Examples, when applicable, are not provided.	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalisation of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are missing, inappropriate, and/or unsupported. Examples, when applicable, are not provided.	Response demonstrates a minimal reflection on, and personalisation of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are unsupported or supported with flawed arguments. Examples, when applicable, are not provided or are irrelevant to the assignment.	Response demonstrates reflection on, and personalisation of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are generally supported. Some relevant examples, when applicable, are provided.	Response demonstrates a general reflection on, and personalisation of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are supported. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable	In-depth reflection on, and personalisation of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented. Extensive evidence of analysis through questioning and challenging of assumptions leading to transformation of personal insight. Well supported by clear, detailed examples as applicable.	In-depth reflection on, and insightful personalisation of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented. Extensive evidence of analysis through questioning and challenging of assumptions leading to significant transformation of personal insight. Well supported by clear, detailed examples as applicable.	Profound reflection on, and personalisation of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented. Extensive evidence of analysis through questioning and challenging of assumptions leading to profound transformation of personal insight. Exceptionally well supported by clear, detailed examples as applicable.
Scholarship	Lacking in evidence of	Minimal evidence of	Limited evidence of	Evidence of relevant	Evidence of relevant	Evidence of relevant	Evidence of wide academic	Evidence of wide academic	Evidence of wide academic

	academic research.	relevant academic research.	relevant academic research.	academic research but omits important areas.	academic research covering the essential areas.	academic research covering more than essential areas and includes some critical appraisal of evidence.	research covering more than essential areas and includes well developed critical appraisal of evidence.	research covering more than essential areas and includes comprehensive critical appraisal of evidence.	research covering more than essential areas and includes a very well articulated comprehensive critical appraisal of evidence.
	0-9	**10-19**	**20-34**	**35-49**	**50-59**	**60-69**	**70-79**	**80-89**	**90-100**