

Code	BMO0265
Title	Rewards Management

Assessment weighting	100%
Group/Individual	Individual
Word Count/Duration	2500 words
Learning Outcomes	MLO1: Critically understand the relationship between the environment, strategy and systems of reward management MLO2: Critically explore the conceptual apparatus and theoretical debates informing reward management. MLO3: Understand and critique the traditional, contingent and knowledge bases for transactional and relational rewards MLO4: Critically evaluate the key issues in reward management MLO5: Be able to critique and design internally consistent reward structures that recognise labour market and equity constraints MLO6: Be able to critically analyse executive and expatriate rewards in an international context

Guidance on AI Usage.	
☒	Level 1- Not Permitted The use of AI tools is not permitted in any part of this assessment.
☐	Level 2 – Some use Permitted Some use of AI tools is permitted in the research/early stages of this assignment, but you must ensure that the work you submit is your own. If you use AI tools, you should acknowledge or reference this in your work. Use the Text reference builder to learn how to reference AI generated ideas. The sorts of questions to consider when using AI are: • Is it accurate? • Are the references genuine? • Has it reproduced bias?

□	Level 3 – Integrated The use of AI tools is integrated in this assessment. Further guidance is included in this assessment brief. Ensure any AI generated material is clearly identified and referenced both within the assignment and in the reference list, using: Text reference builder Image reference builder
---	---

General Study Guidance

- Cite all information used in your work which is clearly from a source. Try to ensure that all sources in your reference list are seen as citations in your work, and all names cited in the work appear in your reference list.
- Reference and cite your work in accordance with the APA 7th system – the University’s chosen referencing style. For specific advice, you can talk to your subject librarians or go to the library help desk, or you can access library guidance via the following link: [APA 7th Referencing Guide](#)
- The University has regulations relating to [Academic misconduct](#), including **plagiarism**. The Academic Skills Team can advise and help you with how to avoid ‘poor scholarship’ and potential academic misconduct.
- If you have any concerns about your writing, referencing, research or presentation skills, you are welcome to consult the Academic Skills Team, you can book tutorial appointments with them via the website [How to book a tutorial appointment](#)
- Further study resources including the Academic Skills Team overview can be found here: [Study resources](#)
- Do not exceed the word limit/time/other limit.

Assessment Task
A 2,500-word report which makes recommendations to the board of directors of the case study organisation for a new pay and reward structure. You should critically discuss the influencing factors which impact on the pay and reward system, expanding on the impact of economic, regulatory, psychological and motivational factors. You should identify the issues that may arise should the organisation not take any remedial action, and you should identify issues around international reward management for the opening of a flagship store in Hong Kong. This assignment is worth 100% of the marks for this module and is the final piece of assessment.
Task Specific Guidance

You should present a structured report to the board of directors making justified and academically supported recommendations for a new pay and reward structure. You should think about the philosophy, the cost vs benefit of a new/better structure and write persuasively to encourage the adoption of your recommendations. You should include discussion and guidance on the international reward strategies for the new Asian store. You should adopt a critical approach and support your work with contemporary sources and references.

Your report should:

1. Define key terms and provide a brief contextual setting for the case study organisation.
2. Critically evaluate key themes with a discussion of current and contemporary research or debate on reward management practices.
3. Highlight any misfit or linkage between key economic, psychological, motivational theories and reward philosophy, strategy and policy to your recommendations. You should draw on influencing factors which may include, but is not limited to:
 - Total reward
 - The psychological contract
 - Factors that influence employer / employee satisfaction with reward systems
 - The notion of equal pay and the Equality Act 2010
 - Performance management
 - Other pertinent issues as relevant
4. Outline and justify your proposals for a new pay and reward structure.
5. Discuss issues related to international reward in relation to the opening of a flagship store in Hong Kong.

The Case Study

VERVE Apparel, a dynamic fashion retailer specializing in modern casual and formal attire across the United Kingdom. Amelia Grant founded the company at the age of seventeen, starting as a small online boutique operated from her bedroom. Her entrepreneurial spirit and gifted vision for upcoming fashion trends brought the brand into mainstream fashion. Within a decade's time, VERVE had grown to 180 retail locations around the country, with a £270 million annual sales. Amelia listed the company on the stock market in early 2017, drawing in a number of investors while still maintaining 50% ownership herself. Despite its commercial success, VERVE Apparel is currently dealing with considerable internal issues, especially with regard to reward management. Amelia's approach on compensation has been influenced by her view that employees need careful supervision to perform well and are largely driven by financial rewards. This mindset has produced a strict, transactional incentive structure that pays very little attention to equity,

PGT Marking Criteria Grid Template

These criteria are intended to help you understand how your work will be assessed. They describe different levels of performance of a given criterion.

Criteria are not weighted equally, and the marking process involves academic judgement and interpretation within the marking criteria.

The grades between Pass and Merit should be considered as different levels of performance within the normal bounds of the module. The higher-level categories allow for students who, in addition to fulfilling the basic requirement, perform at a superior level beyond the normal boundaries of the module and demonstrate intellectual creativity, originality and innovation.

PGT Generic Assessment Criteria

	Unacceptable A superficial answer with only peripheral knowledge of core material and very little critical ability			Unsatisfactory Some knowledge of core material but	Pass A coherent and logical answer which	Merit A coherent answer that demon	Distinction An exceptional answer that reflects outstanding knowledge of material and critical ability		
	0-9	10-19	20-34	35-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-100
Fulfilment of relevant learning	Not met or minimal	Not met or minimal	Not met or partially met	Not met or partially met	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass
Response to the question/task	No response	Little response	Insufficient response	Adequate response, but with limitations	Adequate response	Secure response to assessment task	Very good response to topic; elements of sophisticated	Clear command of assessment task; sophisticated	Full command of assessment task; imaginative
Conceptual and critical understanding of contemporary / seminal knowledge in the subject (20%)	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	Marginally insufficient. Adequate knowledge of concepts within prescribed range but fails to adequately solve problems posed by assessment	A systematic understanding of knowledge; critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights; can evaluate	Approaching excellence in some areas with evidence of the potential to undertake Research. Well-	Excellent. Displays (for example): high levels of accuracy; evidence of the potential to undertake research; the	Insightful. Displays (for example): excellent research potential; flexibility of thought; possibly of publishable	Striking and insightful. Displays (for example): publishable quality; outstanding research potential; originality

Presentation (10%)	Length requirements may not be observed ; does not follow academic conventions; language	Length requirements may not be observed; does not follow academic	Length requirements may not be observed; does not follow academic	Length requirement met and academic conventions mostly followed. Minor errors in language	Length requirement met and academic conventions mostly followed. Possibly	Good standard of presentation; length requirement met, and acade	Very good standards of presentation	Professional standards of presentation	Highest professional standards of presentation
Understanding (20%)	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	Independent, critical evaluation of full range of theories with some	Authoritative, full understanding of all the issues with originality in analysis	Authoritative, full understanding of all the issues with originality in analysis	Authoritative, full understanding of all the issues with originality in analysis
Use of evidence and sources to support task (20%)	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	Complex work and concepts presented, key	Full range of sources used selectively to support argument	Full range of sources used selectively to support argument	Full range of sources used selectively to support argument
Development of ideas (20%)	Argument not developed and may be	Argument not developed and may be	Argument not developed and may be	Argument not fully developed and may lack	The argument is developed	Argument concise and explicit	Coherent and compelling argument	Coherent and compelling argument	Coherent and compelling argument
Ethics, sustainability & Responsibility (Professional practice) (10%)	Not considered or no relevance	Consideration at a superficial level with minimal relevance shown to professi	Considered with relevant solutions identified but no detail relevant to professi	Considered with relevant solutions identified but little detail relevant to professio	Considered with relevant solutions identified and adequate detail relevant to professio	Wide consideration relevant solutions identified and appropriate	Full consideration of implications for professional practice with range of solution	Full consideration of implications for professional practice with extensive range	Full consideration of implications for professional practice with full range of solution