



# ORSSA National Student Competition

## Rubric for adjudication of competition entries

0% — 24%	25% —39%	40% — 49%	50% — 59%	60% — 74%	75% — 100%
<b>1. Problem description / research hypothesis and objectives of study</b>					
Problem description vague. Failure to effectively communicate the essence of the problem. Unclear whether student truly understands the problem.	Problem description lacking in vital information. Possible inconsistencies between problem statement and methodological approach.	Problem description lacking in insight. Failure to make connection between the problem considered and related problems in the literature.	The student demonstrates a good understanding of the problem at hand, but some questions remain.	Problem described clearly, concisely and comprehensively. The student clearly understands the problem considered.	Excellent. The student demonstrates exceptional insight in and understanding of a difficult problem, and is able to clearly communicate the essence of the problem at hand.
<b>2. Literature review</b>					
Literature is outdated, completely irrelevant or missing. The literature is copied without any attempt at interpretation.	No clear connection is made between the literature reviewed and the problem under consideration. No interpretation of what has been read is presented. Very few sources have been consulted.	Literature study is vague, very general and lacking in depth. No indication is given of any insights gained from the review.	The student has successfully synthesised the literature reviewed, although the review is not representative of the literature. Possibly incorrect or incomplete referencing.	A complete, accurate and concise literature study. Correct referencing. Review sticks to the point. The review is up to date and representative of the literature.	Excellent. The student comprehends and applies knowledge outside of formal instruction. Explicit relationship between relevant literature and current topic demonstrated. Student shows signs of critical evaluation and synthesis of the literature.
<b>3. General problem solution approach</b>					
Unrealistic solution approach in the context of the problem under consideration. A solution approach that is not aligned with the objectives of the study and is likely to lead to a failure on achieving the objectives.	Some misalignment between solution approach and study objectives. Solution approach is too simplistic and requires more thought.	An incoherent solution approach. Some aspects of the problem under consideration remain unsolved.	A solid, good, but conventional approach. Solution will lead to marginal success in terms of solving the problem under consideration.	A tailored approach to solving the problem at hand, showing clear problem solution competence. A realistic solution approach capable of leading to successful solution of the problem under consideration if executed well.	Excellent. The student demonstrates awareness of multiple solution approaches and has chosen and motivated an appropriate solution approach for solving the problem at hand.
<b>4. Specific tools, skills and processes applied</b>					
Incorrect application of tools, processes or methodologies. Does not reflect careful judgment or true understanding.	Critical errors and/or assumptions were made in an otherwise somewhat successful application of tools, processes or methodologies.	Appropriate utilisation of discipline-specific tools, processes or procedures. No evidence of deep understanding. Limited competence.	Good competence in terms of the tools, skills and processes applied. Some minor / non-critical errors in the application.	The student clearly demonstrates competence in the use of appropriate tools, skills or processes as well as a depth of insight in their application.	Excellent. The student successfully mastered a difficult set of tools, skills or processes and also demonstrated innovation in their application.

0% — 24%	25% — 39%	40% — 49%	50% — 59%	60% — 74%	75% — 100%
<b>5. Results obtained and their interpretation</b>					
No or little thought has been given to the analysis and interpretation of results emanating from the study. Incorrect approach towards analysing and expressing results. Analysis and presentation of results are misaligned with the study objectives.	Inappropriate method of analysing and interpreting results. Misleading communication of results. Misinterpretation of results. Results inadequate in terms of the study objectives.	Results presented are marginal. Very little insight is evident in their interpretation. Just the basics – the reader is left to interpret the results.	The results are adequate in terms of solving the problem at hand and are analysed appropriately, but the student's interpretation lacks insight. Could have achieved more with little effort.	The results obtained completely solve the problem at hand. The student's insight is evident from the interrogation and discussion of the results. The results can be trusted.	Excellent. The student demonstrates exceptional insight and innovative thinking in the evaluation and discussion of the results obtained.
<b>6. Student's ability to critically challenge assumptions / embrace new thinking</b>					
There is no originality in the project.	Basic flawed assumptions form the premise of the study, yet is never recognised.	Difficult to discern the student's contribution in relation to existing work.	Some originality displayed, but work is not publishable. The student is aware of fundamental assumptions underlying the work.	High level of originality displayed. The work is publishable after some minor to moderate modifications. The underlying assumptions are critically analysed.	Excellent. The student thinks creatively and "outside the box". The work is publishable with no to minor modifications.
<b>7. Student's maturity when reflecting on the work produced</b>					
The student lacks fundamental understanding of the subject matter. No or little reflection is possible due to ignorance.	The student makes no attempt to reflect on the work done.	Nothing more than a superficial reflection. Missing the big picture.	The student is aware of the impact of the project both on his/her personal development and in relation to externalities.	Student exhibits a true understanding of the direct consequences of the project.	Excellent. Reflections demonstrate a deep understanding of even indirect consequences of the project.
<b>8. Quality of the written report /thesis</b>					
Very poor document structure, writing style and/or language usage. Incorrect / inappropriate use of graphical support. Incomprehensible report, difficult to follow. Unprofessional look and feel.	Rife with structure, style and language errors. Document finishing (look and feel) not up to standard.	Written work is passable, but there is ample room for improvement. Some structure, style or language errors.	Report leaves a positive impression. Style perhaps too casual. Formatting perhaps not professional.	General impression of a high-quality report. Appropriate style, structure and language aimed at a suitable audience. Formatting and referencing professional and correct.	Excellent. Report demonstrates a clear and logical flow of presentation, is concisely packaged and reads easily as a result of the effective combination of high-impact, supporting visuals and an articulate presentation.

Weights for the eight criteria are determined by the Selection Committee, and are typically different for the honours/4<sup>th</sup> year and masters categories.