

UBGMF9-15-M - Sustainable Development: Principles and Practice Assessment Brief 2020/2021

The brief

This assessment requires you to provide a succinct overview of sustainable development within **EITHER the city of Bristol OR the healthcare sector in the UK**. You will review relevant contextual documents and strategies in order to critically evaluate the contributions which cities or the healthcare sector can make to achieving sustainable development as well the extent to which city of Bristol or the UK healthcare sector are making their contribution. You will consider whether sufficient monitoring exists to adequately assess the current state of sustainable development within Bristol or the UK healthcare sector and identify the existence of significant data gaps which may prevent robust evaluation of the current situation. In the case of both contexts you will need to select one framework or model of sustainable development to use as your point of reference.

Cities are increasingly seen as key actors in achieving sustainable development, especially by the United Nations. The [New Urban Agenda](#) outlines a vision of cities which are 'just, safe, healthy, accessible, affordable, resilient and sustainable cities and human settlements to foster prosperity and quality of life for all' (United Nations, 2017, p5). Bristol is more active than most cities in considering its role in ensuring achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Bristol City Council have supported the production of a [Voluntary Local Review \(VLR\) of Progress](#) (one of the first in the world) and has produced an [initial assessment of alignment](#) between its own [One City Plan](#) and the SDGs and their sub targets. The city benefits from a SDG Alliance of individuals and organisations committed to the SDGs. However, there remains a need to rapidly progress action towards more sustainable forms of development.

The healthcare sector is multifaceted and sits at the nexus of multiple sustainable development issues. Many goals and targets within the SDGs are centred on health and wellbeing and the operation of healthcare services has numerous environmental, social and economic impacts. The [UN Global Compact SDG Industry Matrix for the Healthcare and Life Sciences sector](#) report provides an overview of these relationships. The NHS Sustainable Development Unit has been working to promote sustainable healthcare within the UK and produced a [Sustainable Development Strategy for the NHS, Public Health and Social Care System in 2014](#). The Strategy has been replaced with the new (Nov 2020) [NHS Net Zero Plan](#). Progress has been made towards reducing the environmental impact of healthcare in the UK but there is some way to go before the full potential of the healthcare sector to be acting primarily for sustainable development is realised.

Discuss significant indicators and metrics which are needed to monitor progress in achieving sustainable development in either Bristol or the healthcare sector and identify any problematic gaps which you feel currently exist in data sets or monitoring processes. Use freely available statistics and data sets for this, please do not contact Bristol City Council or the NHS for data or information.

You will identify no more than three recommendations to Bristol City Council or the NHS as to potentially useful changes to their thinking which would enable them to contribute in more holistic way to sustainable development. Remember to keep your discussion relevant to city or sector/industry level, not organisational. Alternatively, you may have recommendations relating to data and monitoring which you feel are particularly critical for effective

and robust decision-making and action to be undertaken. You should identify your recommendations clearly and each one should flow logically on from your preceding discussion, thus needing little introduction. You may wish to consider one recommendation each for the short-term, medium-term and long term or make recommendations relevant to different stakeholder groups. This is likely to be the section where you have greatest opportunity to demonstrate creativity and innovation. You should use theoretical ideas and evidence of likely success (such as implementation elsewhere/ in other contexts) to inform your proposals so that your reader, or potentially 'client' (Bristol City Council or the NHS) has confidence in your recommendations.

The report should end with a strong conclusion. It should synthesise key elements of your report, potentially making new connections as you draw together the different elements of the report and elaborate on the significance of your main observations and recommendations.

Format

You are required to present your findings in a project report to include the following:

- A. Table of Contents
- B. Introduction
- C. Critical summary of core document linked to chosen topic
- D. Monitoring and data
- E. Recommendations
- F. Conclusion
- G. References

The report should include numbered headings/sub-headings and page numbers. If you are unsure how to do this, you can find a video tutorial via Lynda.Com. This is an online video training portal that you have free access to as a UWE student. Go to LinkedIn Learning via the following link and then put "create a report in word" into the search engine. This is just a recommendation.

<http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/library/searchforthingsa-z/trainingvideolyndacom.aspx>

DO NOT INCLUDE APPENDICES, THEY WILL NOT BE MARKED.

Word Count

The report should be 3,000 words in total. A proposed breakdown of word count is indicated below.

- Introduction (300 words)
- Critical summary of context and core documents (1000 words)
- Monitoring and data (900 words)
- Recommendations (600 words)
- Conclusion (200 words)
- Reference list is not included in the word count

Tables

You may choose to present some elements of your report in tables. It is up to your discretion how you structure each table so as to present your findings in a logical and concise manner. As with all your work, you **MUST** acknowledge the sources used to support your analysis.

References

Please remember that as your report is being assessed for academic purposes it is especially important that you underpin all sections of your work with evidence from and critical analysis of academic and other credible sources of literature. As well as looking at relevant research and other academic literature you are also encouraged to critically analyse credible sources from policy, non-governmental organisations and industry. Please note, however, that use of webpages should be kept to an absolute minimum. It is perfectly legitimate to identify transferable lessons from other sectors so long as you make a logical and evidenced-based case for doing so.

You must provide full and accurate references using the **UWE Harvard** system whenever any part of your report cites or is directly informed or supported by external materials or resources. For further information, see the university's referencing guidelines (for instance via the library or 'iskillzone' websites, or the Study Skills links on Blackboard). You may be interested in library courses on referencing, for instance on the use of [software such as Mendeley or Zotero](#) to manage your references efficiently. See a [guide to referencing](#).

Please see the Assessment Criteria below for further guidance.

Further information

To carry out this project successfully you will need to be creative and innovative in finding information and then applying what you find to the task in hand. Do not expect to find everything you need from a single source or for there to be one right way to approach the task. We are not looking for proposals that are immediately implementable or fool-proof, rather that you have:

- undertaken rigorous research relevant to the task at hand
- studied the core documents which form the basis of the brief in sufficient depth to be able to use them to create a concise summary about the context for your report and to draw conclusions about key short and medium term priorities for the city
- understood and made relevant use of some of the key sustainability concepts, frameworks and tools covered by the module and your independent reading and research.
- made reasonable assumptions and applied logical thinking in the approach that you take to the task and the recommendations that you make.

Study skills

Your ability to engage with academic literature and undertake critical analysis is a key competency that we expect you to develop and demonstrate at postgraduate level. At this level, taught sessions will give you an overview and introduction to key themes in the field, but your own research and other independent engagement with the subject will be critical to your success in your programme of study.

The study skills web site will guide you towards online and one-to-one support:

<http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/students/studysupport/studyskills.aspx>.

International students may wish to take advantage of English language and a range of academic study support that is offered. Please see the following link for further information.

<http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/study/internationalstudents/internationalstudentsupport/englishlanguagesupport.aspx>

Everyone should try to use this module as an early opportunity to assess your own study skills needs. Help is at hand for all the following and many more besides...

- Finding and evaluating information
- Reading and note-taking
- Critical writing
- Writing essays and reports
- Referencing to avoid plagiarism
- Referencing tools
- Time management

Project submission

To be accepted, your work **must**:

- be submitted in Microsoft format. The main report should be in Word format with a file extension of .docx or .doc.
- include your student number on the front page of all documents submitted
- not include your name on any documentation
- comply with the word limit, which is 3,000 words. The word limit *excludes* references and diagram captions, but includes tables.
- utilise materials such as tables and diagrams in a focussed, relevant and concise manner. They need to be referred to in the text with appropriate labelling (e.g. Table 1, Figure 1, etc). Please note, table labels go above the table. Figure labels go below figures.
- **be submitted electronically** via the Blackboard site for this module. You will need to upload your report using the software facilities provided. The Assignments folder on Blackboard includes usage instructions including submission advice and appropriate precautions you should take. Your marks and written feedback can also be accessed via Blackboard.
- be submitted (and received) by the deadline, **14:00 on Thursday, March 18 2021**.

Please note that the submission deadlines are absolute and based on UWE server time, therefore you are strongly advised to submit work well ahead of the deadline dates to avoid situations where penalties could be incurred. If penalties are imposed it will result in late work submissions being capped or not accepted for marking.

The following webpage includes a wealth of information about assessment at UWE, including what to do if you are experiencing any problems that are affecting your ability to carry out the assignment:

<http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/students/academicadvice/assessments.aspx>

Formative feedback

The series of workshops that support this module will be an important source of formative feedback and it is vital that you attend these. In addition there will be an opportunity to receive individual formative feedback on a draft of your report. For most students this will take place during individual appointments to be held in early March. More details on this will be provided in class.

Assessment criteria

Your project will be assessed against the following criteria:

Knowledge and Understanding

- Knowledge of sustainable development and its relevant application to fulfil the brief
- Independent and creative thinking in approaching the task

Academic Underpinnings

- Range of relevant literature and other learning materials consulted and referred to
- Statements, arguments, recommendations and conclusions in the report are supported effectively using appropriate academic literature as well as credible sources from policy and practice
- Referencing of literature and other sources is accurate and in line with UWE Harvard referencing system

Analytical and Critical Thinking

- Demonstration of critical thinking including sound evaluation and synthesis of relevant issues and sources
- Demonstration of analytical and logical thinking
- Arguments, recommendations and conclusions are substantiated

Communication and Presentation

- Clear, succinct communication of complex issues
- Clear structure with appropriate formatting
- Professional writing style and presentation appropriate to a consultancy report
- Accurate syntax, spelling and punctuation

Table 1 shows you the marking scheme that will be used to assess your work. Please consult the following webpage for information about how differential levels of award e.g. Pass, Merit, Distinction are calculated at postgraduate level. <http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/students/academicadvice/degreeclassification.aspx>
Please contact the Student Advisers (via infopoint@uwe.ac.uk) and not academic staff for any matters relating to the Academic Regulations and their interpretation.

Table 1. SDPP marking scheme

	Mark (%)	Knowledge and understanding	Academic underpinnings	Analytical and critical thinking	Communication and presentation
DISTINCTION	>85% Exceptional	Exceptional depth of knowledge and understanding. Exceptional application of this knowledge to the brief. Exceptional level of independent and innovative thought.	Extremely comprehensive up-to-date range of relevant literature considered. Outstanding use of highly relevant and exceptionally wide range of academic and sources from policy and practice to support statements, arguments, recommendations and conclusions throughout the submission. Referencing of literature and other sources is faultless and conforms precisely to UWE Harvard requirements.	Exceptional critical and analytical thinking. Response to all aspects of the brief convincingly underpinned by outstanding, in-depth analysis and highly sophisticated synthesis of learning resources and key issues. Extremely logical approach and argumentation throughout submission. All arguments, ideas, recommendations and conclusions within the submission are substantiated in an exceptionally convincing manner.	Mastery of clarity in argument and communication. Exceptionally persuasive style. Highly creative and extremely professional standard of presentation with no typographical or formatting errors.
	70 – 84% Excellent	Excellent depth of knowledge and understanding. Excellent application of this knowledge to the brief. Advanced level of independent and innovative thought.	Excellent range of relevant literature considered. Advanced use of very wide range of academic literature and sources from policy and practice to underpin all elements of the submission. Excellent standard of referencing throughout, which is virtually faultless and conforms to UWE Harvard requirements.	Advanced standard of critical and analytical thinking. Excellent analysis and synthesis of learning resources and key issues. Excellent logical approach and argumentation throughout. All arguments, ideas, recommendations and conclusions within the submission are substantiated in a very convincing manner.	Consistently excellent standard of communication and presentation throughout.
MERIT	65 – 69% Very good 60 - 64% Good	Good / very good depth of knowledge and understanding. Good / very good application of this knowledge to the brief. Independent / innovative thought is strongly in evidence.	Good / very good range of relevant literature considered. Use of academic literature and sources from policy and practice is strong and used effectively to support most of the main elements of the submission. Referencing is to a very high standard, largely conforming to UWE Harvard requirements.	Critical and analytical thinking strongly in evidence. Good / very good analysis and synthesis of learning resources and most of the key issues relevant to the brief. Logical approach and argumentation is good / very good throughout. Most arguments, ideas, recommendations and conclusions are substantiated convincingly.	Clarity of communication is good / very good overall. Standard of presentation is high / very high although there may be occasional typographical errors.

PASS	55 – 59% Competent 50 - 54% Adequate	Adequate / competent depth of knowledge and understanding. Adequate / competent application of this knowledge to the brief. Some evidence of independent / innovative thought.	Use of academic literature and sources from policy and practice to support main elements of the submission is generally adequate / competent, but overly relies on limited range of sources and/or some elements of submission not underpinned sufficiently by an evidence base. Referencing is generally accurate and appropriate, but with minor omissions or inaccuracies.	Some elements of critical and analytical thinking, but approaches to the literature and key issues are largely descriptive. Logic is generally sound, but not consistent throughout. Synthesis is generally adequate / competent, but lacking in depth. Approach to substantiating ideas, recommendations and conclusions is generally adequate / competent, but some elements are not convincing or neglected altogether.	Communication is generally adequate / competent. Standard of presentation is adequate / competent, but there are inconsistencies and occasional faults such as errors in syntax, spelling and punctuation and minor formatting errors.
MARGINAL FAIL	45 - 49% Weak 40 - 44% Poor	Weak / poor depth of knowledge and understanding. Limited or inappropriate application to the brief.	Very limited range of literature considered. Use of literature to support statements, arguments, recommendations and conclusions is patchy with over-reliance on non-academic or otherwise weak sources. Standard of referencing is weak / poor with many inaccuracies and omissions.	Critical and analytical thinking is very limited, superficial or unconvincing. Logical approach is largely absent. Attempt to synthesise key aspects of presentation is very limited or unconvincing. Very little or unconvincing attempt to substantiate key ideas/recommendations/ conclusions.	Weak / poor standard of communication and presentation in places or throughout.
FAIL	<40% Very poor	Knowledge and understanding is extremely superficial or absent altogether. There are many factual errors, inaccuracies, misconceptions and omissions. Attempt to apply knowledge to the brief is extremely limited, non-existent or highly inappropriate.	Consideration of relevant literature is extremely limited or non-existent. Little or no attempt to adopt UWE Harvard system.	Critical and analytical thinking, logical approach and synthesis are absent. No attempt to substantiate ideas or recommendations.	Extremely poor standard of communication and presentation in places or throughout.

Marking, Marks and Resits

Marking

As a project module all of your work will be double blind marked. This means that two tutors will separately look at the work submitted by all students on the module. Both tutors will record their marks and feedback separately and then compare marks and resolve differences to produce an agreed mark and feedback. The period for providing feedback will not normally exceed 20 working days (excluding University closure days) following the deadline for submission of the assessment concerned. This period may be shorter or longer for some forms of assessment. Where the period is greater than 20 working days, students will be informed of the deadline and the rationale for the extension.

All marks should be considered provisional until they are confirmed at the module Field Board. This is where an academic from another university (External Examiner) scrutinizes our approach to assessment to ensure that it is fair and consistent and that other benchmark academic standards are met. As part of this the External Examiner assigned to this module will look at a sample of the student work submitted. The Field Board for this module will take place in June 2021.

Further information and advice about all such matters can be found at:

<http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/students/academicadvice.aspx>

Resits

Should you fail the module, there will be an opportunity to Resit the assessment in early summer 2021. The facility to upload Resit coursework will be made available on the main module Blackboard after results are confirmed at the June Field Board.

Problems meeting the deadline

The page at the link below provides useful information about the options available if you are unable to meet a deadline or have a (non-academic) problem with an assessment, for example, illness or personal issues that are affecting your ability to complete an assignment.

<http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/students/academicadvice/additionalassessmentsupport.aspx>

Please contact the Student Advisers via InfoPoint for further advice and support.

- Telephone: +44 (0)117 32 85678
- Email: infopoint@uwe.ac.uk