## Danh mục Rubrics đánh giá năng lực người học (PLOs) theo Chương trình Tiên tiến, Chất lượng cao & POHE, đáp ứng chuẩn ACBSP

(Ban hành kèm theo Quyết định số ......./QĐ-ĐHKTQD, ngày ..... tháng.... năm 2019 của Hiệu trưởng)

| TT | Tên rubrics                             | Trang |
|----|---|-------|
| 1  | Rubric for Global Learning Assessment   | 2     |
| 2  | Rubric for Technical Skills             | 4     |
| 3  | Rubric for Integrative Learning         | 7     |
| 4  | Rubric for Communication Skills         | 9     |
| 5  | Written Communication Assessment Rubric | 9     |
| 6  | Oral Communication Assessment Rubric    | 11    |
| 7  | Rubric for Teamwork Assessment          | 13    |
| 8  | Rubric for Problem Solving              | 15    |

### 1. Rubric for Global Learning Assessment

Global learning is a critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people's lives and the earth's sustainability. Through global learning, students should (1) become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences, (2) seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities, and (3) address the world's most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably.

| No  | Topic                     | (Note: Assigned scor  | re within a range is   | nent of Topic<br>subjective assessn<br>met.)  | nent of degree criterion is   |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| 140 | торіс                     | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)   | Meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 70-84)   | Below<br>Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet Expectation<br>(range 0-44)  |
| 1   | Global Self-<br>Awareness | Effectively addresses significant issues in the natural and human world based on articulating one's identity in a global context.   | Evaluates the global impact of one's own and others' specific local actions on the natural and human world.  | influence the natural and human   | Identifies some connections between an individual's personal decision-making and certain local and global issues.   |
| 2   | Perspective<br>Taking     | Evaluates and applies diverse perspectives to complex subjects within natural and human systems in the face of multiple and even conflicting positions (i.e. cultural, disciplinary, and ethical.)    | Synthesizes other perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when investigating subjects within natural and human systems.   | Identifies and explains multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when exploring subjects within natural and human systems. | Identifies multiple perspectives while maintaining a value preference for own positioning (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical).  |
| 3   | Cultural<br>Diversity     | Adapts and applies a deep understanding of multiple worldviews, experiences, and power structures while initiating meaningful interaction with other cultures to address significant global problems. | Analyzes substantial connections between the worldviews, power structures, and experiences of multiple cultures historically or in contemporary contexts, incorporating respectful interactions with other cultures. | contexts with some  | Describes the experiences of others historically or in contemporary contexts primarily through one cultural perspective, demonstrating some openness to varied cultures and worldviews. |

| No | Topic  | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| No | Торіс  | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)   | Meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 70-84)   | Below<br>Expectation<br>(range 45-69)  | Not meet Expectation<br>(range 0-44)   |  |
| 4  | Personal and<br>Social<br>Responsibility                       | Takes informed and responsible action to address ethical, social, and environmental challenges in global systems and evaluates the local and broader consequences of individual and collective interventions.   | Analyzes the ethical, social, and environmental consequences of global systems and identifies a range of actions informed by one's sense of personal and civic responsibility. | Explains the ethical, social, and environmental consequences of local and national decisions on global systems.  | Identifies basic ethical dimensions of some local or national decisions that have global impact.                       |  |
| 5  | Understanding<br>Global<br>Systems                             | Uses deep knowledge of the historic and contemporary role and differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems to develop and advocate for informed, appropriate action to solve complex problems in the human and natural worlds. | systems, including their historic and contemporary interconnections and the differential effects of human organizations and actions, to pose elementary solutions to           | Examines the historical and contemporary roles, interconnections, and differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems within the human and the natural worlds. | Identifies the basic role of some global and local institutions, ideas, and processes in the human and natural worlds. |  |
| 6  | Applying<br>Knowledge to<br>Contemporary<br>Global<br>Contexts | Applies knowledge and skills to implement sophisticated, appropriate, and workable solutions to address complex global problems using interdisciplinary perspectives independently or with others.  | disciplinary   | challenges that use  | Defines global challenges<br>in basic ways, including a<br>limited number of<br>perspectives and solutions.            |  |

#### 2. Rubric for Technical Skills

Quantitative Literacy (QL) – also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning (QR) – is a "habit of mind," competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

| No  |  | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 110 | Торіс  | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)   | Meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 70-84)   | Below Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet<br>Expectation (range<br>0-44)  |  |
| 1   | Interpretation Ability to explain information presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)           | Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information. For example, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph and makes reasonable predictions regarding what the data suggest about future events. | explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a | Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph, but may miscalculate the slope of the trend line. | the trend data shown<br>in a graph, but will<br>frequently<br>misinterpret the                           |  |
| 2   | Representation  Ability to convert relevant information into various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words) | Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding.  | Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and desired mathematical portrayal.                        | Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is only partially appropriate or accurate.  | Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is inappropriate or inaccurate. |  |

| No  | Topic   | Assessment of Topic  (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degre is met.)   |   |   | nt of degree criterion  |
|-----|---|--|---|---|---|
| 140 | торіс   | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)  | Meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 70-84)  | Below Expectation<br>(range 45-69)  | Not meet<br>Expectation (range<br>0-44)   |
| 3   | Calculation   | Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.)                                | Calculations<br>attempted are<br>essentially all<br>successful and<br>sufficiently<br>comprehensive to<br>solve the problem.                            | Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem. | Calculations are attempted but are both unsuccessful and are not comprehensive.               |
| 4   | Application / Analysis Ability to make judgments and draw appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data, while recognizing the limits of this analysis | Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.   | Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from this work. | analysis of data as the<br>basis for<br>workmanlike (without<br>inspiration or nuance,  | the basis for<br>tentative, basic<br>judgments, although<br>is hesitant or<br>uncertain about |
| 5   | Assumptions Ability to make and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis   | Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions. | Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why assumptions are appropriate.   | Explicitly describes assumptions.   | Attempts to describe assumptions.   |

| No | Torio   | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)  |   |  |  |
|----|---|---|---|--|--|
|    | Торіс   | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)   | Meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 70-84)  | Below Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet<br>Expectation (range<br>0-44)  |
| 6  | Expressing quantitative evidence in support of the argument or purpose of the work (in terms of what evidence is used and how it is formatted, presented, and contextualized) | Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, presents it in an effective format, and explicates it with consistently high quality. | Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be | Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work. | Presents an argument for which quantitative evidence is pertinent, but does not provide adequate explicit numerical support. (May use quasi-quantitative words such as "many," "few," "increasing," "small," and the like in place |

### 3. Rubric for Integrative Learning

Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and cocurriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

| Nia | Torio   | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)   |   |   |   |  |
|-----|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| No  | Торіс   | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)  | Meet Expectation<br>(range 70-84)   | Below<br>Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 0-44)   |  |
| 1   | Connections to Experience Connects relevant experience and academic knowledge                                       | Meaningfully synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom (including life experiences and academic experiences such as internships and travel abroad) to deepen understanding of fields of study and to broaden own points of view. | (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to illuminate concepts/ theories/  |   | Identifies connections between life experiences and those academic texts and ideas perceived as similar and related to own interests. |  |
| 2   | Connections to Discipline Sees (makes) connections across disciplines, perspectives                                 | Independently creates wholes out of multiple parts (synthesizes) or draws conclusions by combining examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.  | Independently connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.               | When prompted, connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.                          | When prompted, presents examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.                                |  |
| 3   | Transfer Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations | Adapts and applies, independently, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve difficult problems or  | Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve | Uses skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation to contribute to understanding of | Uses, in a basic way, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation.                       |  |

| NI - |   | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)  |   |   |   |  |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| No   | Торіс   | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)   | Meet Expectation<br>(range 70-84)   | Below<br>Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 0-44)                                     |  |
|      |   | explore complex issues in original ways.  | problems or explore issues.   | problems or issues.   |   |  |
| 4    | Integrated<br>Communication   | Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) in ways that enhance meaning, making clear the interdependence of language and meaning, thought, and expression. | Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) to explicitly connect content and form, demonstrating awareness of purpose and audience. | format, language,<br>or graph (or other<br>visual<br>representation)<br>that connects in a<br>basic way what is   | · /   |  |
| 5    | Reflection and Self-<br>Assessment Demonstrates a developing sense of self as a learner, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts (may be evident in self-assessment, reflective, or creative work) | Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences) that have occurred across multiple and diverse contexts.  | Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).              | Articulates strengths and challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self-awareness). | Describes own performances with general descriptors of success and failure. |  |

### 4. Rubric for Communication Skills

### 4.1. Written Communication Assessment Rubric

| No | Torio                                     | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)                               |   |  |   |  |
|----|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| No | Topic                                     | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)  | Meet Expectation<br>(range 70-84)   | Below Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 0-44)   |  |
| 1  | Clarity/<br>Meaning:                      | Responds thoroughly<br>to the assignment.<br>Defined critical<br>thinking skills with a<br>strong point of view.                             | but may lack clarity<br>or be too   | Lacks a clear<br>understanding of the<br>assignment;<br>repetitive; simplistic;<br>some critical<br>thinking.  | Lacks a deep<br>understanding of the<br>assignment; no<br>viable point of view;<br>little or weak<br>evidence; weak<br>critical thinking.   |  |
| 2  | Development,<br>Reasoning and<br>Support: | Includes well-chosen<br>examples and<br>expands on those<br>examples in<br>appropriate detail.   | Uses some examples that may be too vague, wordy, excessive- or ill-placed. Some examples may not be fully thought out or integrated successfully.                               | Selected examples<br>don't demonstrate a<br>clear understanding<br>of the situation. Too<br>few or too many<br>examples that don't<br>mesh well.                   | Examples are far too<br>general or lack any<br>detail, and do not fit<br>the purpose of the<br>assignment.<br>Inappropriate or<br>insufficient<br>examples, reasons or<br>other evidence. |  |
| 3  | Organization/<br>Format:                  | Main point is presented or clearly implied with noticeable coherence; provided specific and accurate support. No errors in format.           | Limited organization<br>and focus; may<br>demonstrate some<br>lapses in coherence<br>or progression of<br>ideas. Confuses<br>format with other<br>types of writing.             | Very beginning stages of organization taking form. Has understanding of paragraphing but lacks transitions and paragraph cohesiveness.                             | Disorganized and<br>unfocused; serious<br>problems with<br>coherence and<br>progression of ideas;<br>weak or non-<br>existent main point.<br>No attempt at proper<br>format.              |  |
| 4  | Language:                                 | Sophisticated choice of language and sentence structure; precise and purposeful, demonstrating a command of language and sentence structure. | Developing facility<br>in language use;<br>sometimes uses<br>weak vocabulary or<br>inappropriate usage<br>or word choice;<br>sentence structure<br>tends to be<br>5repetitious. | Limited facility in<br>language use;<br>sentence structure<br>issues throughout the<br>document rendering<br>it ineffective. Overall<br>problems with<br>interest. | Displays frequent<br>and fundamental<br>errors in vocabulary;<br>sentences are<br>simplistic and<br>disjointed losing<br>meaning and<br>competence.                                       |  |
| 5  | Conventions:                              | Control of conventions; free of  | An accumulation of errors that impact   | Frequent errors in grammar and/or  | Errors interfere with writer's ability to   |  |

| No  | Торіс | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.) |                                   |  |  |  |
|-----|-------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 140 |       | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)  | Meet Expectation<br>(range 70-84) | Below Expectation<br>(range 45-69)                           | Not meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 0-44)  |  |
|     |       | mechanical errors—a polished document.   |                                   | spelling that distract<br>the reader from<br>writer's ideas. | consistently communicate purpose; pervasive mechanical errors obscure meaning. |  |

### 4.2. Oral Communication Assessment Rubric

| No  | Торіс                             | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)                          |   |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 110 | тори                              | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)   | Meet Expectation<br>(range 70-84)   | Below<br>Expectation<br>(range 45-69)  | Not meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 0-44)  |  |  |
| 1   | Organization                      | Information is presented in an organized and logical fashion. It has been well prepared and practiced.                                  | Information organized and presented adequately. Minor problems with topic transition and information flow.  | Information organized and presented adequately. Some problems with topic transition and information flow.  | Information presented in a disorganized manner. Abrupt transition from one point to another. Does not appear prepared.                                   |  |  |
| 2   | Clarity of<br>Key Points          | clear and fully supported with  | Main points were clear. Support for contentions with reason and/or well-chosen examples were good. Adequate summary of main points at the conclusion. | Main points were clear. Support for contentions with reason and/or well -chosen examples could have been more compelling. Summary of main points could have been stronger. | Main points were<br>neither clear nor<br>supported with<br>appropriate<br>reasoning or<br>examples. Little<br>or no summary<br>of key points.            |  |  |
| 3   | Eye Contact<br>with<br>Audience   | Never or rarely glances at notes. Consistently makes eye contact with the audience.   | Unobtrusive use of speaker notes. Sometimes fails to make eye contact with the audience.  | Conspicuous use of speaker notes. Occasional makes eye contact with the audience.  | Virtually reads<br>speech from<br>notes. Avoids<br>eye contact with<br>audience.   |  |  |
| 4   | Vocal<br>Presentation<br>and Tone | Articulation, volume, and pace are excellent. Vocal tone is excellent and professional. The presentation is enthusiastic and assertive. | business<br>presentation. A   | casual for a professional business presentation.   | Speaks too fast or too slow. Volume inappropriate. Giggling or other inappropriate vocal behaviors interfere with the message. Extremely monotone with a |  |  |

| No  | Topic            | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.) |  |   |  |  |  |
|-----|------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 140 |                  | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)  | Meet Expectation<br>(range 70-84)  | Below<br>Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 0-44)  |  |  |
|     |                  |  |  | enthusiasm and assertiveness.   | complete lack of enthusiasm.   |  |  |
| 5   | Body<br>Language | Appears confident, poised, comfortable, relaxed, and in control. Body language enhances the presentation.      | Appears relaxed, confident and comfortable. Body language does not distract from the presentation. | Appears slightly nervous. Occasional use of meaningful hand gestures. Body language needs some improvement but does not distract. | Appears nervous. Paces, fidgets, or sways. Poor use of hands (e.g. jiggles taps or plays with something). Body language distracts. |  |  |

### 5. Rubric for Teamwork Assessment

Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)

| No | Торіс   | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)   |   |  |  |  |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|
|    |   | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)  | Meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 70-84)  | Below Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet<br>Expectation (range<br>0-44)  |  |
| 1  | Contributes<br>to Team<br>Meetings                            | Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.  | Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others.  | Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.   | Shares ideas but does<br>not advance the work<br>of the group                      |  |
| 2  |   | in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as  | Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others. | Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification. | Engages team members by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting. |  |
| 3  | Individual<br>Contributions<br>Outside of<br>Team<br>Meetings | Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence. | Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project.   | Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project.  | Completes all assigned tasks by deadline.  |  |
| 4  | Fosters<br>Constructive<br>Team Climate                       | Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following:  | Supports a constructive team climate by doing   | Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following:  | Supports a constructive team climate by doing any one of the following:            |  |

| No | Торіс                   | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.)   |  |  |   |  |
|----|-------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
|    |                         | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)  | Meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 70-84)   | Below Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet<br>Expectation (range<br>0-44)   |  |
|    |                         | Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.  Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.  Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.  Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members. | any three of the following:  • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.  • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.  • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.  • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members | or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task | polite and constructive in communication.  • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.  • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.  • Provides assistance and/or encouragement |  |
| 5  | Responds to<br>Conflict | Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.   | Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it.  | Redirecting focus<br>toward common<br>ground, toward task<br>at hand (away from<br>conflict).  | Passively accepts<br>alternate<br>viewpoints/ideas/opinio<br>ns.  |  |

# 6. Rubric for Problem Solving

| No | Topic   | Assessment of Topic (Note: Assigned score within a range is subjective assessment of degree criterion is met.) |  |  |   |  |
|----|---|--|--|--|---|--|
|    | Торк  | Exceed Expectation (range 85-100)  | Meet<br>Expectation<br>(range 70-84)   | Below Expectation<br>(range 45-69)   | Not meet<br>Expectation (range<br>0-44)   |  |
| 1  | <b>Identification</b> of central problems in a complex situation.   | Identification of all major problems and relevant issues involved in the situation.                            | Identification of<br>the main problems<br>but not all relevant<br>issues and other<br>problems that may<br>be related. | [ *  | Failure to identify major problems involved in a complex business situation.                |  |
| 2  | Recognition of multiple causal factors involved in a problem situation.   | Identified all relevant causal factors involved in a problem situation.  | causal factor but  | Identified causes, but<br>not clear on main<br>problem and other<br>factors.                   | Failure to identify<br>any causal factors<br>involved in a problem<br>situation.            |  |
| 3  | Correct usage of<br>theories, methods,<br>professional<br>guidance, and/or<br>principles to address<br>the problem. | Effective application of all relevant theories, methods, and/or professional guidance to address the problem.  | Correct Identification of major theories, methods, and professional guidance to address the problem.                   | Ineffective application of relevant theories, methods or professional guidance.                | Usage of incorrect or irrelevant theories and professional guidance to address the problem. |  |
| 4  | Generation of plausible <b>alternative</b> solutions to solve the problem.  |  | Generation of plausible alternative solutions to the problem that are either effective or efficient.                   | Generation of plausible alternative solutions to the problem.                                  | Failure to generate plausible alternative solutions to solve a problem.                     |  |
| 5  | Provision of persuasive reasons and evidence in support of proposed solutions.                                      | Provision of<br>strongly persuasive<br>reasons and<br>evidence to<br>support proposed<br>solutions.            | Provision of reasonable arguments and evidence to support proposed solutions.  | Provides reasons or<br>evidences, but not<br>reasonable or<br>supported proposed<br>solutions. | Failure to provide reasons or evidence to support proposed solutions.                       |  |