|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | ***Airline, Aviation***  ***& Travel Careers*** | **Career Portfolio**  **Project Assessment Rubric**  *(Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment)* | | Student: | Instructor: | |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Date: | Class: | | Student Learning Outcome: | | |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | **Criteria** | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Score** | 1: Unacceptable | 2: Needs Improvement | 3: Emerging | 4: Competent | 5: Exemplary | **Points** | | **Subject Matter** | Vague characterization and knowledge of the subject matter. | Incomplete grasp and rudimentary characterization of the subject matter. | Adequate comprehension and characterization of the subject matter. | Competent knowledge with some analysis of the subject matter. | Creative application of knowledge with demonstrated integration and comprehensive analysis of the subject matter. |  | | **Writing Mechanics** | Pervasive pattern of errors in word choice, sentence structure, grammar, and usage. Suggests difficulties in reading/writing English. Inappropriately brief. Lacks structure or development. | Inadequate research while not addressing course concepts. Major points are addressed, but not well supported. Frequent errors in word choice, structure, grammar, and usage. | Content and purpose of the writing are clear, but fails to elaborate. Paper is over/under word length. Some errors in word choice, structure, grammar, and usage. | Accurate and informative content. Paper follows designated guidelines. Few errors in word choice, structure, grammar, and usage. | Insightful and persuasive analysis with well-supported points. Demonstrates full knowledge of grammar, punctuation, and the subordination of ideas. |  | | **Presentation Skills** | Limited focus on central idea. Inaccurate, generalized, or irrelevant content. Unsupported Ideas. Lack of clear articulation. | Minimally credible or relevant content and loose connection to topic. Haphazard structure. Undeveloped and poorly prepared presentation. | Appropriate visuals and information. Adequately specific, relevant, sufficient and credible content. Effective flow. | Engaging, well organized, complete and clear content. Aids are familiar but enhance the overall quality of the presentation. | Unique, creative, or fresh approach. Highly specific, credible, relevant, comprehensive, and interesting content. Powerful, engaging and effective. |  | | **Critical Thinking** | No analysis. Inconsistent and unreflective content that shows little evidence of research. | Unorganized, incomplete, and underdeveloped analysis straying away from the topic. | Successful but ordinary analysis. Provides standard information not reflective of complete research. | Good integration and formulation with logical flow of researched and required information. Demonstrates good grasp of topic and its implications. | Comprehensive conception of the topic including analysis, synthesis, evaluation and application of new perception to information and applicable research. |  | | **Technology** | Unsatisfactory and inadequate ability to use technological tools. Sources are not cited. | Insufficient, cluttered, or confusing layout. Poor usage graphics and resources. Sources improperly cited. | Visible, adequate, and appropriate technological elements. Reflects use of technological resources. Some sources are cited. | Good incorporation of key elements in design, representing skill in the use of technology. Sources are properly cited. | Significant evidence of originality and inventiveness in the effective integration of multimedia or graphical elements to show technological expertise. Use of reliable, reputable sources and citations using accurate format. |  | | **Overall Score** | ***An overall score of 3.5 or higher (which is 70%) is required to pass*.** | | | | |  | |   **Comments**: |
|  |