

PRACTICUM RUBRIC

(Executive & International MBA, Master of Human Resource Management, Master of Marketing)

Please sign each page of the grading form.

Section	Includes all key areas	Includes most of the key areas	Poorly written and includes very few of the key areas
ONE: Executive Summary and Introduction <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content;">MARK AWARDED:</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The executive summary is clearly written and summarises key elements of the report. <input type="checkbox"/> The introduction to the topic clearly defines the scope of the study and shows the significance and justification. <p>4-5 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The executive summary is generally well written and includes key elements of the report. <input type="checkbox"/> The introduction describes the scope of the study but does not clearly describe the significance and justification. <p>3 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The executive summary omits key elements of the report. <input type="checkbox"/> The introduction is not adequate and does not provide insight into the study. <p>0-2 marks</p>
TWO: Conceptual Framework & Literature review <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content;">MARK AWARDED:</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> There is a critical and comprehensive review of the literature based on the objectives and conceptual framework. <input type="checkbox"/> The conceptual framework adequately identifies and defines concepts and explores relationships among concepts. It also discusses how the concepts are operationalised in the study. <p>11-15 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Although the literature review is comprehensive it is not always critical. <input type="checkbox"/> The objectives are generally well defined but properly linked to the conceptual framework. <input type="checkbox"/> The conceptual framework adequately identifies and defines concepts and explores relationships among concepts. <p>8-10 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The literature review is irrelevant, lacks coherence and critical analysis. <input type="checkbox"/> The intentions and objectives are not clearly stated and insufficiently linked to the conceptual framework. <input type="checkbox"/> The conceptual framework is limited to identification and definition of concepts. <p>0-7 marks</p>

Name of Advisor _____ Name of Second Marker _____ 1

Advisor Signature _____ Date _____ Second Marker Signature _____ Date _____



Section	Includes all key areas	Includes most of the key areas	Poorly written and includes very few of the key areas
<p>THREE: Research strategy Analysis & Synthesis</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>MARK AWARDED:</p> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ There is a clear rationale for the research methodology. ❑ The research strategy is clearly defined outlining suitable tools and data gathering techniques that sufficiently address the research problem. ❑ The presentation is accurate and defensible with the proper use and description of graphs and tables. ❑ The analysis is accurate and defensible and informed by sound information gathering and data analysis methods. ❑ There is appropriate presentation, analysis and synthesis of the overall findings which is guided and informed by the theories and bodies of knowledge of the various subject areas of the programme. <p>21-30 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ There is some justification for the research methodology. ❑ The research strategy is stated but data gathering tools and techniques do not sufficiently address the research problem. ❑ The data is generally accurate and defensible with most graphs and tables appropriately used and described. ❑ The data is suitably presented but the analysis and interpretation do not adequately inform the intervention. ❑ There is some attempt to link relevant theory to the analysis. <p>14-20 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ The rationale for the research methodology is unclear. ❑ The research strategy, data gathering tools and techniques are not well defined. ❑ The data was not logically presented and did not incorporate suitable presentation tools. ❑ There are many inaccuracies in the data, which is not logically presented, no description of tables and graphs. ❑ The analysis is weak and does not include critical information relevant to the intervention. ❑ There is a general absence of the application of relevant theory. <p>0-13 marks</p>

Name of Advisor _____ Name of Second Marker _____ 2

Advisor Signature _____ Date _____ Second Marker Signature _____ Date _____



Section	Includes all key areas	Includes most of the key areas	Poorly written and includes very few of the key areas
<p>FOUR: Practicality & Description of the Intervention, analysis of the intervention</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin-top: 20px;"> <p>MARK AWARDED:</p> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ The intervention in its design is feasible according to the objectives of the study. ❑ Relevant issues such as, cost efficiency, sustainability, achievement of financial and strategic objectives, compatibility with the culture of the organisation etc. are effectively addressed. ❑ A relevant analytical framework (such as PESTLE, SWOT, Five Forces etc.) was employed in the design/analysis of the intervention. ❑ The outputs and outcomes of the intervention are clearly stated with learnings connected to departmental and organisational issues such as financial, human, technical etc. <p>25-35 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ The intervention in its design is mostly feasible according to the objectives of the study. ❑ Some critical issues relevant to the organisation were omitted or insufficiently addressed. ❑ The analytical framework adopted is satisfactory but not fully explored. ❑ The outputs and outcomes of the intervention are stated but learnings were not always linked to departmental and organisational issues. <p>18-24 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ The intervention in its design is not feasible according to the objectives of the study. ❑ Critical issues were not effectively addressed. ❑ The intervention does not make use of pertinent analytical frameworks in its design/analysis. ❑ The outputs and outcomes of the intervention are not clearly stated and/or linked to departmental and organisational issues. <p>0-17 marks</p>

Name of Advisor _____ Name of Second Marker _____ 3

Advisor Signature _____ Date _____ Second Marker Signature _____ Date _____

Section	Includes all key areas	Includes most of the key areas	Poorly written and includes very few of the key areas
FIVE: Conclusions & Recommendations <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content;"> MARK AWARDED: </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The conclusions and recommendations are concise, relevant, linked to reported results, and supported by the research data. <input type="checkbox"/> The issues identified for action based on the analysis and intervention are specific, achievable, realistic and solutions-oriented. <input type="checkbox"/> The recommendations directly or indirectly address the identified problem or need. <p>7-10 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The conclusions and recommendations are concise, relevant, somewhat linked to reported results, and somewhat supported by the research data. <input type="checkbox"/> The issues identified for action based on the analysis and intervention are to some extent specific, achievable, realistic and solutions-oriented. <input type="checkbox"/> The recommendations directly or indirectly fairly address the identified problem or need. <p>5-6 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The conclusions and recommendations are not concise, irrelevant, not linked to reported results, and not supported by the research data. <input type="checkbox"/> The issues identified for action based on the analysis and intervention are general, not achievable, unrealistic and not solutions-oriented. <input type="checkbox"/> The recommendations directly or indirectly do not address the identified problem or need. <p>0-4 marks</p>

Name of Advisor _____ Name of Second Marker _____ 4

Advisor Signature _____ Date _____ Second Marker Signature _____ Date _____



Section	Includes all key areas	Includes most of the key areas	Poorly written and includes very few of the key areas
SIX: References & Academic Writing <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content;"> MARK AWARDED: </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The report includes a completed list of all works referenced, using the Chicago Manual Style of Referencing. <input type="checkbox"/> The use of language (grammar, spelling etc.), readability and referencing in the report is proper and well structured. <p>4-5 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The report includes a partial list of all works referenced, using the Chicago Manual Style of Referencing. <input type="checkbox"/> The use of language (grammar, spelling etc.), readability and referencing in the report are somewhat proper and well structured. <p>3 marks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The report is poorly written and does not include a completed list of all works referenced, using the Chicago Manual Style of Referencing. <input type="checkbox"/> There is incorrect use of language (grammar, spelling etc.), and poor readability and referencing in the report. <p>0-2 marks</p>
TOTAL MARKS:			

Name of Advisor _____ Name of Second Marker _____ 5

Advisor Signature _____ Date _____ Second Marker Signature _____ Date _____



ARTHUR LOK JACK
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
THE UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST INDIES

General Comments:

Name of Student: _____ **Student ID#:** _____

Date student submitted: _____ **Approved Deadline:** _____

Name of Advisor _____ **Name of Second Marker** _____ 6

Advisor Signature _____ **Date** _____ **Second Marker Signature** _____ **Date** _____