

Global Public Relations: Final Group Project Grading Rubric (30 pts.)

Component	Sophisticated	Competent	Not Yet Complete
<p>Teamwork (3 pts.) UP TO 3 pts. will be taken from individual member grades in case of not contributing to the project and/or not coming to all team meetings.</p>	<p>The team worked well together to achieve objectives. Each member contributed in a valuable way to the project. All data sources indicated a high level of mutual respect and collaboration.</p>	<p>The team worked well together most of the time, with only a few occurrences of communication breakdown or failure to collaborate when appropriate. Members were mostly respectful of each other.</p>	<p>Team did not collaborate or communicate well. Some members would work independently, without regard to objectives or priorities. A lack of respect and regard was frequently noted.</p>
<p>Contribution (9 pts.) UP TO 9 pts. will be taken from individual member grades in case of not contributing to the project and/or not coming to all team meetings.</p>	<p>All requirements and objectives are identified, evaluated and competed. The deliverable offered new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Likewise, the application is based on stated criteria, analysis and constraints.</p>	<p>All requirements are identified and evaluated but some objectives are not completed. The deliverable offered some new information or approach to the topic under discussion. The application is reasonable; further analysis of some of the alternatives or constraints may have led to a different recommendation.</p>	<p>Many requirements and objectives are not identified, evaluated and/or completed. The deliverable offered no new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Few application considerations are analyzed and other factors were ignored or incompletely analyzed.</p>
<p>Subject Knowledge (6 pts.)</p>	<p>The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major and minor concepts into the plan. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking about the topic.</p>	<p>The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major concepts into the response. The deliverable demonstrated evidence of limited research effort and/or initial of thinking about the topic.</p>	<p>The deliverable did not demonstrate knowledge of the course content, evidence of the research effort or depth of thinking about the topic.</p>
<p>Supporting Material (6 pts.)</p>	<p>All relevant information was obtained and information sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were well supported by the information.</p>	<p>Sufficient information was obtained and most sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were mostly supported by the information.</p>	<p>Insufficient information was obtained and/or sources lack validity. Analysis and design considerations were not supported by the information collected.</p>
<p>Composition (3 pts.)</p>	<p>The deliverable was well organized and clearly written. The underlying logic was clearly articulated and easy to follow. Words were chosen that precisely expressed the intended meaning and supported reader comprehension. Diagrams or analyses enhanced and clarified presentation of ideas. Sentences were grammatical and free from errors.</p>	<p>The deliverable was organized and clearly written for the most part. In some areas the logic and/or flow of ideas were difficult to follow. Words were well chosen with some minor expectations. Diagrams were consistent with the text. Sentences were mostly grammatical and/or only a few spelling errors were present but they did not hinder the reader.</p>	<p>The deliverable lacked overall organization. The reader had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. Diagrams were absent or inconsistent with the text. Grammatical and spelling errors made it difficult for the reader to interpret the text in places.</p>
<p>Speaking Skills and Presentation (3 pts.) No points to the person who does not speak during the final presentation.</p>	<p>Team members were poised and had clear articulation. Every team member spoke and participated at a very high and balanced level. Speakers demonstrated good volume, and eye contact. Enthusiasm and confidence was exuded. The presentation fit into the time allotment of 15 minutes.</p>	<p>Team members were mostly audible and/or fluent on the topic, but: 1) not all team members spoke and/or participated in a high and balanced level; 2) eye contact was broken with audience; 3) light discomfort with public speaking was exuded; and/or 4) the presentation slightly went over the 15-minute allotment.</p>	<p>Team members were often inaudible and/or hesitant and relied heavily on notes. Speakers had distracting nonverbal signs little or no audience eye contact. A high level of discomfort with public speaking was exuded. The presentation went well over the 15-minute allotment, with no recognition of end of time.</p>