****

**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:** |  |