****

**Rubrics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Points  Attribute | 4 | 2 | 0 | Weight | Points |
| Presentation of the context/background | * All relevant information is included * No extraneous material, information is presented concisely and clearly * Provides a clear picture of the organization | * Some relevant information is missing * Little extraneous material is included * Provides a rather clear picture of the organization | * Substantial relevant information is missing * Excessive extraneous material is included * The information provided makes it difficult or impossible to get a clear picture of the organization | 2 |  |
| Analysis and evaluation of the factors which make the company a good-practice example | * Presents an insightful and thorough analysis of identified factors * Extensive analysis of several factors * Analysis is based on evidence | * Presents an analysis of the identified factors * Some factors are missing in the analysis * Most parts of the analysis are grounded in evidence | * Presents a superficial analysis of the identified factors * Factors are not clearly presented * Evidence base for analysis remains unclear | 3 |  |
| Link to the SDG framework | * It is clearly explained how the firm’s strategies and measures relate to the chosen SDG(s) | * The SDG framework is mentioned, but the link to the identified measures and strategies remains partly unclear | * SDG Framework is not addressed | 3 |  |
| Critical reflection | * The analysis of the chosen firm is complemented by the team’s own critical reflection and an adequate amount of evidence by third parties (e.g. NGO or other stakeholders) | * The team briefly mentions some critical aspect, but does not provide third-party evidence to substantiate it | * The case cast rests on the firm’s own information only, without critical reflection | 2 |  |
| Recommendations | * Recommendations for the company emerge from the analysis * Recommendations are convincing and supported by arguments | * Recommendations are linked to the analysis * Recommendations are partly supported by arguments | * Link between recommendations and analysis remains unclear * Recommendations nooot supported by arguments | 2 |  |
| Video/Presentation quality | * Presented in a logical sequence which allows the audience to follow effortlessly * Interesting and enthusiastic presentation, clear voice, easy to understand | * Sequence is partly not logic; Audience has difficulty following in some parts of the presentation * Low voice and/or monotonous presentation, difficult to understand | * Sequence of information is unintelligible * Presentation is incomprehensible for the audience | 2 |  |
| Time management | * Completed assignment was posted on or before the deadline * All deadlines were met * Team members showed up for the Skype meeting * Length of case cast is within 2:30 min. limit | * Completed assignment was posted within 24 hours after the deadline * Most deadlines were met * Team members missed one skype meeting * Length of case cast is within 10% beyond 2:30 min. limit | * Completed assignment was posted past 24 hours after the deadline * Team missed deadlines * Team members missed more than one Skype meeting * Length of case cast exceeds 2:30 min. limit by more than 10% | 1 |  |
| Maximum points: 60 **Points achieved:** | | | | |  |