

YOUR UNIVERSITY
Independent Research Project ORAL presentation
(Oral Presentation Rubric)

<i>Candidate Details:</i>
<i>Title of Independent Research Report:</i>
<i>Submission Date:</i>
<i>Examiner Details:</i>

	<i>Performance Indicator</i>			
	<i>Unacceptable Level</i>	<i>Acceptable Level</i>	<i>High Performance level</i>	<i>Exceptional Performance Level</i>
<i>Learning outcome</i>				
Problem identification and definition (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student does not establish the need for the research. • Introduction is fragmented, background and aim not clear. • Research problem or question stated but is not explicit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable attempt is made by the student to establish the need for the research. • A clear Introduction, but background and aim could be clearer. • Research question articulated; but complicated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good attempt is made by the student to establish the need for the research. • A good Introduction, clear background and aim. • Research question is clearly articulated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An excellent attempt is made by the student to establish the need for the research. • An excellent Introduction, clear background and aim. • Research question is evidently articulated.
Adequacy of the literature review (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inadequate range of journal articles selected. • Some articles are irrelevant to the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable range of journal articles selected. • Articles are relevant to the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good range of high quality journal articles selected. • Articles are relevant to the topic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An excellent range of high quality journal articles selected. • Articles are relevant and extend the topic.
Organise information in a logical and coherent way (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some headings not provided and/or inappropriate. • Some information provided relates to the topic, but is incomplete. • Discussion lacks flow and is somewhat disjointed and fragmented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headings and sub-headings are appropriate. • Information provided relates to the topic but is cursory. • Discussion flows well, but is disjointed or fragmented in some places. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headings and sub-headings are informative. • Information clearly covers the breadth and depth of the topic. • Discussion has a logical flow and coherent line of argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headings and sub-headings are informative. • Information extends the breadth and depth of the topic. • Discussion has a logical flow and coherent line of argument.

Learning outcome	Performance Indicator			
	Unacceptable Level	Acceptable Level	High Performance level	Exceptional Performance Level
Critically analyse and synthesise the information gathered (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The analysis is descriptive and lacks depth of knowledge and insight. • Research question / hypothesis is not justified. • Research question / hypothesis does not clearly emerge from the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The analysis is constructive but lacks depth of knowledge and insight. • Research question / hypothesis is somewhat justified. • Research question / hypothesis emerges from some of the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The analysis is constructive shows depth of knowledge and insight. • Research question / hypothesis is justified. • Research question / hypothesis emerges from the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The analysis is constructive shows excellent depth of knowledge and insight. • Research question / hypothesis is justified with depth and insight. • Research question / hypothesis emerges easily from the literature.
Methods chosen to address the aims (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method remains unjustified in terms of previous work • Method is not appropriate for information required • Selection/sampling method (if required) is not appropriate • Description of methods is incomplete and verbose • Does not demonstrate a clear understanding of limitations of method used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justification of method somewhat in terms of previous work • Method appropriate for information required • Selection/sampling method (if required) is appropriate • Description of methods is acceptable but remains incomplete • Clear understanding of limitations of method used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method in terms of previous work is well justified but not detailed • Method is clearly appropriate for information required • Selection/sampling method is justified and fitting (if required) • Complete and concise description of methods • Good understanding of limitations of method used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method in terms of previous work is excellent with detailed justification • Method is obviously appropriate for information required • Selection/sampling method is justified and extensive (if required) • Comprehensive and succinct description of methods • Advanced understanding of limitations of method used
Communicate information accurately (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent spelling and/or grammatical errors. • Paraphrasing uses too much of the authors words. • Too much quoted material provided, and some presented incorrectly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some spelling and/or grammatical errors. • Some paraphrasing correct yet still uses too much of the authors words. • Too much quoted material used, but presented correctly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very minor spelling and/or grammatical errors. • Paraphrasing correctly portrays another's ideas in student's own words. • Quotations used sparingly and presented correctly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No spelling and/or grammatical errors. • Paraphrasing expertly applied. • Quotations used expertly and presented correctly.

<i>Learning outcome</i>	<i>Performance Indicator</i>			
	<i>Unacceptable Level</i>	<i>Acceptable Level</i>	<i>High Performance level</i>	<i>Exceptional Performance Level</i>
Refer to information sources accurately (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An attempt to use the APA method has been made, but not entirely correct. In-text citations are mostly inaccurate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References provided under the APA method are accurate in most cases. In-text citations are accurate in most cases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References provided under the APA method are accurate. In-text citations are accurate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References provided under the APA method are accurate. In-text citations are accurate.

OVERALL EVALUATION

Our best students should be capable of exceeding a high Honours level (i.e. 85 or above) for their project. High Honours results at the upper H2A level (75-79) or HI level (80 and above) should be the realistic objective of all students. Marks at an H3 level (50 - 59) and H2B (60 - 69) are acceptable, but not outstanding. I evaluate the project as follows (please tick one):

Project Evaluation	(Please tick one box)
Exceeds High Honours level (85 and over)	
First Class Honours (80-84)	
Honours IIA (70-79)	
Honours IIB (60-69)	
Honours III (50 - 59)	
Fail (below 50)	

My comments on the project and the grounds for my recommendations are as follows.

_____ / Please attach additional comments if more space is required. In arriving at the above evaluation I have followed the guidelines provided to me by the School of Management and Marketing.

Signed: _____ Dated: / /

Students will be given a copy of your comments. If you wish, your name will not be passed to either the student or supervisor.

Project Feedback	(Please tick if appropriate)
I am happy to be identified to the student	
I am happy to be identified to the supervisor	