

In order to apply the standard of quality assessment and evaluation of student's performance, all graduate students of ICO NIDA will be evaluated by using rubric evaluation criteria. Below are some of the criteria adopted by our professors and faculty members in the evaluation of student's performance.

Level of Performance - Evaluation criteria				
	Excellent (A,A-)	Good/Acceptable (B+,B,)	Fair (B-,C+)	Unsatisfactory (C and below)
1. Research article	Able to demonstrate an understanding of concepts central to different research paradigms	Able to make broad distinctions between research philosophies and approaches	Able to identify research types, but mostly with reference to examples rather than concepts	Inability to articulate distinctions in research theories and practices.
2. Class Presentation	Presentation is clever and original / Engaging; captures interest of audience / Appropriate variety of visual aids / Visual aids add to or clarify presentation / Each presenter speaks clearly and loudly; good eye contact; appropriate body language / Members contribute equally to the presentation	Presentation is thoughtful / Presentation is well done; interesting to audience / Some use of visual aids / Visual aids somewhat add to or clarify presentation / Most of the time, presenter speaks clearly and loudly; some eye contact; some use of appropriate body language / Most of the members contributed equally to the presentation	Presentation is at times clearly presented / Presentation is at times interesting to audience / Limited use of visual aids / Visual aids do not clarify or add the presentation / Presenter is hard to hear; little eye contact; poor body language / Some members did not contribute equally to the presentation	Little creativity used; bland / Presentation is hard to follow; poorly organized / No use of visual aids / Presenter cannot be heard; no eye contact; poor body language / Some members did not contribute to the presentation

Level of Performance - Evaluation criteria				
	Excellent (A,A-)	Good/Acceptable (B+,B,)	Fair (B-,C+)	Unsatisfactory (C and below)
3. Seminar preparation and participation	Significant contribution to discussion with a demonstrable integration of theories and practice	Consistent preparation of seminar questions	Sporadic reading. Inability to link topics in class with discussions	Consistent lack of preparedness
4. Review article	Has a clear command of the critical review process, and demonstrates this by referring to key sources and research examples.	Can identify areas of inconsistency in samples of research with reference to specific examples.	Can work 'backwards' by describing research strategies and decisions, but cannot clearly reference these to paradigms.	Little understanding of traditions and practices of research. Unable to conceptualize inquiry.
5. Work group project	Does a full share of work or more / Assigns a clearly defined role; group members perform roles effectively / Always considers all views and helps team to reach fair decision / Never argues with teammates / Group tries to solve its problems by itself without seeking outside help	Does an equal share of work / Assigns roles, but roles are not clearly defined or consistently adhered to / Usually considers all views and helps team to reach fair decision / Rarely argues / Group seldom solves its problems as a team and asks classmates or teacher for help	Does almost as much work as others / Assigns roles, but roles are not adhered to / Often sides with friends instead of considering all views / Sometimes argues / Group settles problems and gives up easily	Does less work than other group members / No effort made to assign roles to group members / Acts as cliques or individuals rather than group / Arguments within group / Little attempt to solve problems; gives up easily