

RUBRICS (REPORT & PRESENTATION) - Total : 100 marks; Weightage : 30%

1) LANGUAGE, ORGANISATION AND FORMATTING - 10 MARKS

Proficient 10.0 to 8.0	Developing 7.5 to 5.0	Underperforming 4.5 to 0.0	Max
No spelling or grammatical errors.	Some spelling or grammatical errors but does not impede comprehension.	Numerous spelling and grammatical errors such that it is difficult for the marker to understand the key points.	10
Written in formal English and without slipping into conversational English.	Writing is inconsistent; switching from formal to informal English.	Report is written in informal and/or conversational English throughout eg. Typical of social media chats.	
Usage of appropriate capitalisation, punctuation and proper sentence structure.	Attention was paid to ensure capitalisation, punctuation and proper sentence structure even though there were some signs of shorthand commonly used in social platforms.	There was a lack of appropriate capitalisation, punctuation and proper sentence structure.	
Cover page was duly filled and Appendix was appropriately utilised.	Cover page was incomplete; Header and footer omitted.	Communication lacks clarity and attention to the basics of writing.	
Report followed the conventional writing structure and was organised with an Introduction, body and conclusion.	Report followed conventional writing structure but the lack of headings and sub-headings or the poor choice of headings or sub-headings resulted in paper that did not have a strong logical flow.	Cover page was omitted / incomplete or lacked accuracy.	
Header and footer were used.	Lack of paragraphs resulted in lack of focus.	Appendix was not utilised or inappropriately used.	
Headings and sub-headings were used to enhance the structure and flow of the report.	Overall report was tidy with some inconsistencies.	Header and footer were omitted.	
Overall report was tidy, consistent and professional.	Resources used were cited and referenced with omissions. APA standards not applied.	Report did not adhere to conventional writing structure.	
Resources used were consistently cited and referenced. APA standards applied.		Omission of headings and sub-headings and lack of paragraphs resulted a lack in organisation and focus.	
		Overall report showed a lack of attention to organisation and formatting.	
		Resources used were not cited and reference was incomplete/missing. APA standards not applied.	

2) MANPOWER RESOURCES (Questions a & b) - 25 MARKS

Proficient 25.0 to 20.0	Developing 19.5 to 12.5	Underperforming 12.0 to 0.0	Max
<u>Question a</u> Insightful and thorough explanations that demonstrate clear understanding of the service level.	<u>Question a</u> Reasonable explanations that demonstrate somewhat clear understanding of the service level.	<u>Question a</u> Unclear explanations about the service level.	25
Excellent thoroughness in showing the workings and/or visuals to derive the answer.	Satisfactory workings and/or visuals shown to explain how the answers are derived.	Poor and/or unclear workings and/or visuals shown to explain how the answers are derived.	
<u>Question b</u> Insightful and thorough explanations in deriving the work-hours and manpower calculations; with clear links to course materials.	<u>Question b</u> Reasonable explanations in deriving the work-hours and manpower calculations; with somewhat clear links to course materials.	<u>Question b</u> Poor level of explanations in deriving the work-hours and manpower calculations; with unclear links to course materials.	
Excellent thoroughness in showing the workings and/or visuals in deriving the answers.	Satisfactory workings and/or visuals shown to explain how the answers are derived.	Poor level and/or messy workings and/or visuals shown to explain how the answers are derived.	

3) DC PRICINGS (Question c) - 20 MARKS

Proficient 20.0 to 16.0	Developing 15.5 to 10.0	Underperforming 9.5 to 0.0	Max
Insightful and thorough explanations in deriving the pricings; with clear links to course materials.	Reasonable explanations in deriving the pricings; with somewhat clear links to course materials.	Poor level of explanations in deriving the pricings; with unclear links to course materials.	20
Excellent thoroughness in showing the workings and/or visuals in deriving the answers.	Satisfactory workings and/or visuals shown to explain how the answers are derived.	Poor level and/or messy workings and/or visuals shown to explain how the answers are derived.	

4) LAYOUT DESIGN & SPACE REQUIREMENTS (Questions d, e & f) - 25 MARKS

Proficient 30.0 to 24.0	Developing 23.5 to 15.0	Underperforming 14.5 to 0.0	Max
<p><u>Question d</u></p> <p>Solutions recommended were suitable and effective for layout, safety and security.</p> <p>Clear illustrations and legends were presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of the solutions.</p> <p><u>Question e & f</u></p> <p>Insightful and thorough explanations in deriving the layout values; with clear links to course materials.</p> <p>Excellent thoroughness in showing the workings and/or visuals in deriving the answers.</p>	<p><u>Question d</u></p> <p>Solutions recommended were fair but limited in the effectiveness for layout, safety and security.</p> <p>Relevant illustrations and legends were superficially presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of the solutions.</p> <p><u>Question e & f</u></p> <p>Reasonable explanations in deriving the layout values; with somewhat clear links to course materials.</p> <p>Satisfactory workings and/or visuals shown to explain how the answers are derived.</p>	<p><u>Question d</u></p> <p>Solutions were badly constructed and not effective for layout, safety and security.</p> <p>Illustrations and legends were absent or minimally shown.</p> <p><u>Question e & f</u></p> <p>Poor level of explanations in deriving the layout values; with unclear links to course materials.</p> <p>Poor level and/or messy workings and/or visuals shown to explain how the answers are derived.</p>	30

1) STRUCTURE OF PRESENTATION - 5 MARKS (Shared mark for all group members)

Proficient	Developing	Underperforming	Max
5.0 to 4.0	3.5 to 2.5	2.0 to 0.0	
The Presentation had no grammatical, spelling or formatting error and were consistent in style.	The Presentation had detectable grammatical or spelling but did not impede communication.	The Presentation had glaring grammatical, spelling or formatting error such that it was distracting.	5
Content had a logical flow from one part / presenter to another.	Some formatting error or were inconsistent in style but not too distracting.	Content flow from one part / presenter to another was a bit abrupt or random.	
Images and visual tools enhanced the communication value of the presentation.	Content had a logical flow from one part / presenter to another.	Images and visual tools were used but either too many; served very little purpose other than to cover up any lack in substance, or too few such that the audience had to rely on the Presenter to make sense of the content or 'imagine' what the Presenter is trying to communicate.	
Overall, the slides were audience-centric, persuasive and professional.	Images and visual tools were used appropriately but some slides were too wordy or some images were superfluous to the presentation.	Overall, the slides appeared to be hastily put together without vetting or careful thought.	
	Overall, the slides were informative.		

2) PACE AND INTONATION OF SPEECH, PROJECTION OF VOICE AND PRONUNCIATION OF WORDS - 5 MARKS (Individual)

Proficient	Developing	Underperforming	Max
5.0 to 4.0	3.5 to 2.5	2.0 to 0.0	
Natural but not conversational / informal presentation. Proper English language.	Affected; artificial, pretentious, and designed to impress. Too performative.	Monotonous; dull, repetitive, lacking in variation in tone or pitch. Unable to maintain formal presentation language, frequent use of Singlish.	5
Audible and well-paced; not too fast or slow and consistent.	Sounded like broadcaster or emcee for an event. Accidental use of Singlish but not distracting.	Inaudible and unable to project voice despite being asked to speak up (no physical ailments or pre-condition).	
	Audible (or inaudible but able to self-correct when there are cues from the audience) and either too fast or too slow.		

3) CONFIDENCE, PERSUASIVENESS AND EXPRESSION - 5 MARKS (Individual)

Proficient	Developing	Underperforming	Max
5.0 to 4.0	3.5 to 2.5	2.0 to 0.0	
Highly persuasive; Natural; not overly rehearsed or contrived and communication was logical and clear.	Persuasive, nervous but managed such that it does not distract the audience and communication was achieved.	Not persuasive. Unable to maintain composure and confidence.	5
Expression is pleasant / open and alert throughout presentation.	Occasionally, unaware of expression and comes across as distracted or preoccupied but able to self-correct.	Unaware of expression and its impact on presentation (no physical ailments or pre-condition).	