

Scoring Rubrics

Presentation

Standard Level / Marking Criteria	Above Standard (75-100%)	Standard (50-74%)	Close to Standard (25-49%)	Below Standard (0-24%)
Delivery of content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Fluent, smooth, easy and quick for audience to get the points -Uses proper pauses and puts timely emphasis on words or important information to hold audience's attention. -Speaks at the right pace. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Fluent, smooth, easy for audience to get the points -Uses proper pauses. -Speaks at the right pace. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Not eloquent with occasional halts. -Speaking too fast to understand or too slowly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Unsmooth or frequently repeats words like 'Uh' and 'Ah'. -Many halts. -Speaks too fast to understand or too slowly.
Eye contact	Continual eye contact to keep audience's attention focused on the content.	Considerable eye contact.	Little eye contact.	No eye contact or keeps looking at scripts.
Voice tone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Full of confidence -At the right pitch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Confident -At the right pitch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Little shaky -Up and down pitch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Shaky -Low pitch like whispering or high pitch like yelling or shouting.
Body language	Smooth body language such as appropriate hand gestures to hold or direct audience's attention to the delivered content.	Ample body language such as hand gestures to keep audience's interest in the delivered content.	Little body language	No body language

Date published: April 9th, 2019.

Scoring Rubrics

Independent Study

Standard Level / Marking Criteria	Above Standard (75-100%)	Standard (50-74%)	Close to Standard (25-49%)	Below Standard (0-24%) *
Well-roundedness and accuracy **	-Well-rounded with completeness of all issues. -Reference information is true to the proven facts.	-Well-rounded with some issues still incomplete. -Reference information is true to the facts.	-Not well-rounded with some issues still incomplete. -Parts of reference information are inaccurate.	-Misses the point. -Not well-rounded with all issues still incomplete. -Parts of reference information are inaccurate.
Clarity and analytical depth	-Explanations / arguments / observations clearly demonstrate analytical thinking process. - Explanations / arguments / observations reflect deep analytical skill.	-Explanations / arguments / observations clearly demonstrate analytical thinking process. -Explanations / arguments / observations reflect analytical skill level corresponding to the topic / research question.	-Explanations / arguments / observations do not clearly demonstrate analytical thinking process, due to considerable proportion of descriptive facts. - Explanations / arguments / observations reflect shallow analytical skill.	- Explanations / arguments / observations are descriptive facts without analysis.
Coherence of content	Complete coherence	Incoherent in some parts	Incoherent in most of the content	Complete incoherence
Suitability and Accuracy of the language used	-Proper academic language -Good selection of words, correct grammar and spelling. -Completely legible hand-writing.	-Academic language slightly mixed with colloquialisms. -Good selection of words, correct grammar and spelling. -Completely legible hand-writing.	-Academic language heavily mixed with colloquialisms. -Improper selection of words, incorrect grammar and spelling in some parts. -Hardly legible hand-writing in some parts.	-Colloquialisms -Improper selection of words, incorrect grammar and spelling in some parts. -Hardly legible hand-writing in many parts or illegible hand-writing.
Content amount	Appropriate amount pursuant to the topic / answers to research questions.	Appropriate amount pursuant to the topic / answers to research questions.	Inadequate amount for the topic / answers to research questions.	Completely inadequate amount for the topic / answers to research questions.

Standard Level / Marking Criteria	Above Standard (75-100%)	Standard (50-74%)	Close to Standard (25-49%)	Below Standard (0-24%) *
Credibility of reference information sources	High credibility sources such as academic journals on international and / or national databases, research published by national-level organizations etc.	High credibility sources such as academic journals on international and / or national databases, research published by national-level organizations etc.	Some reference sources are short of credibility such as blogs or websites with unverified names of writers and / or other details failing to build credibility for the information on the blogs or websites as proven facts.	Low credibility and / or no reference to sources of information.
Student participation	Regular participation	Frequent participation	Occasional participation	Little participation / No participation

Remarks: * 0 mark is assigned only to students who fail to sit the examination or fail to answer one or all of the questions.

** Factors taken into account are as follows:

1. Research question / Research objective
2. Literature review
3. Methodology
4. Information analysis
5. Discussion on results and conclusion / recommendations

Date published: April 9th, 2019.

Scoring Rubrics

Take-home examination - Report - Essay

Standard Level / Marking Criteria	Above Standard (75-100%)	Standard (50-74%)	Close to Standard (25-49%)	Below Standard (0-24%) *
Well-roundedness and accuracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Well-rounded with completeness of all issues. -Reference information is true to the proven facts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Well-rounded with some issues still incomplete. -Reference information is true to the fact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Not well-rounded with some issues still incomplete. -Parts of reference information are inaccurate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Misses the point. -Not well-rounded with all issues still incomplete. -Parts of reference information are inaccurate.
Clarity and analytical depth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanations / arguments / observations clearly demonstrate analytical thinking process. - Explanations / arguments / observations reflect deep analytical skill. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanations / arguments / observations clearly demonstrate analytical thinking process. -Explanations / arguments / observations reflect analytical skill level corresponding to the topic / research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanations / arguments / observations do not clearly demonstrate analytical thinking process, due to considerable proportion of descriptive facts. - Explanations / arguments / observations reflect shallow analytical skill. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanations / arguments / observations are descriptive facts without analysis.
Coherence of content	Complete coherence	Incoherent in some parts	Incoherent in most of the content	Complete incoherence
Suitability and Accuracy of the language used	-Proper academic language	-Academic language slightly mixed with colloquialisms.	-Academic language heavily mixed with colloquialisms.	-Colloquialisms

Standard Level / Marking Criteria	Above Standard (75-100%)	Standard (50-74%)	Close to Standard (25-49%)	Below Standard (0-24%) *
	-Good selection of words, correct grammar and spelling. -Completely legible hand-writing	-Good selection of words, correct grammar and spelling. -Completely legible hand-writing.	-Improper selection of words, incorrect grammar and spelling in some parts. -Hardly legible hand-writing in some parts.	-Improper selection of words, incorrect grammar and spelling in some parts. -Hardly legible hand-writing in many parts or illegible hand-writing.
Content amount	Appropriate amount pursuant to the topic / answers to research questions.	Appropriate amount pursuant to the topic / answers to research questions.	Inadequate amount for the topic / answers to research questions.	Completely inadequate amount for the topic / answers to research questions.
Credibility of reference information sources	High credibility sources such as academic journals on international and / or national databases, research published by national-level organizations etc.	High credibility sources such as academic journals on international and / or national databases, research published by national-level organizations etc.	Some reference sources are short of credibility such as blogs or websites with unverified names of writers and / or other details failing to build credibility for the information on the blogs or websites as proven facts.	Low credibility and / or no reference to sources of information.
Participation of students in group work **	Regular participation	Frequent participation	Occasional participation	Little participation / No participation

Remarks: * 0 mark is assigned only to students who fail to sit the examination or fail to answer one or all of the questions.

** In case of group work on assigned reports, an individual student's opinion report corresponding to the content of the assigned report is used as a measure of participation.

Date published: April 9th, 2019.

Scoring Rubrics

Closed-book examination

Standard Level / Marking Criteria	Above Standard (75-100%)	Standard (50-74%)	Close to Standard (25-49%)	Below Standard (0-24%) *
Well-roundedness and accuracy	-Well-rounded with completeness of all issues. -Reference information is true to the proven facts.	-Well-rounded with some issues still incomplete. -Reference information is true to the fact.	-Not well-rounded with some issues still incomplete. -Parts of reference information are inaccurate.	-Misses the point. -Not well-rounded with all issues still incomplete. -Parts of reference information are inaccurate.
Clarity and analytical depth	-Explanations / arguments / observations clearly demonstrate analytical thinking process. - Explanations / arguments / observations reflect deep analytical skill.	-Explanations / arguments / observations clearly demonstrate analytical thinking process. -Explanations / arguments / observations reflect analytical skill level corresponding to the research question.	-Explanations / arguments / observations do not clearly demonstrate analytical thinking process, due to considerable proportion of descriptive facts. - Explanations / arguments / observations reflect shallow analytical skill.	- Explanations / arguments / observations are descriptive facts without analysis.
Suitability and Accuracy of the language used	-Proper academic language -Good selection of words, correct grammar and spelling. -Completely legible hand-writing.	-Academic language slightly mixed with colloquialisms. -Good selection of words, correct grammar and spelling. -Completely legible hand-writing.	-Academic language heavily mixed with colloquialisms. -Improper selection of words, incorrect grammar and spelling in some parts. -Hardly legible hand-writing in some parts.	-Colloquialisms -Improper selection of words, incorrect grammar and spelling in some parts. -Hardly legible hand-writing in many parts or illegible hand-writing.

Remarks: * 0 mark is assigned only to students who fail to sit the examination or fail to answer one or all of the questions.

Date published: April 9th, 2019.