APM Thesis Rubric

Assessor:

Student's Name:

Student's ID:

Criteria	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Good (3)	Poor (2)	Poor (0-1)
Introduction	Cleary and compellingly identifies the central theme in an engaging manner.	Appropriately identifies the central theme.	Identifies the central theme, but it is partially unclear.	The central theme is recognizable, but difficult to identify.	Does not identify the central theme.
Research Objectives and Problem Statement	Research objectives and problems are clearly stated and compelling.	Research objectives and problems are appropriately stated.	Research objectives and problems are stated, but with some unclear parts.	Research objectives and problems are unclear and confusing.	Research objectives and problems are not stated.
Research Questions / Hypotheses	Clearly defines the research questions or identifies important hypotheses in an original manner.	Defines the research questions or identifies important hypotheses, but minor revisions are needed.	Defines the research questions or identifies important hypotheses, but many parts are unclear.	Fails to well-define the research questions or incorrectly identifies important hypotheses.	Research questions/hypotheses are not stated.
Literature Review	Reflects a very clear and excellent understanding of business administration concepts. Theories regarding the theme are comprehensively covered.	Reflects a good understanding of business administration concepts. Theories regarding the theme are appropriately discussed.	Reflects an average understanding of business administration concepts. Theories regarding the theme are moderately discussed.	Reflects an insufficient understanding of business administration concepts. Theories regarding the theme are inadequately discussed.	Reflects a very insufficient understanding of business administration concepts. Theories regarding the theme are not discussed.
Methodology	Methodology is very well-written/implemented and highly suitable for the type of research. It is also directly linked to the research objectives and questions.	Methodology is moderately well-written/implemented and suitable for the type of research, though with some weak links to the research objectives and questions.	Parts of the methodology are stated, but not sufficiently linked to the research objectives and questions.	Description of the methodology is insufficient, and the applied methods are irrelevant or inappropriate to the research objectives and questions.	Methodology is not stated.
Analysis and Integration of Knowledge	Demonstrates critical and accurate analysis with very good application of business administration knowledge/tools.	Shows consistent application of business administration knowledge/tools; analysis requires some revisions but is sufficient.	Partial application of business administration knowledge/tools, with occasional lack of consistency in the analysis.	Analysis is minimal or incomplete, with little application of business administration knowledge/tools.	No analysis and no application of business administration knowledge/tools are observed.

Criteria	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Good (3)	Poor (2)	Poor (0-1)
Conclusion	Clearly answers the research questions, identifies insightful and original conclusions, and clearly outlines areas for future research.	Answers most of the research questions, though some parts require revision. Limitations and areas for future study are identified.	Answers some of the research questions, but mostly repeats the content already presented in the text. Limitations and areas for future study are identified but unclear.	Answers a few research questions, but the conclusions and areas for future research are unclear.	No conclusions and no answers to the research questions. Does not provide implications, limitations and areas for future study.
Overall Structure	The overall structure is extremely logical and clear. The writing is clearly organized around the central theme, allowing readers to easily follow the logic.	The overall structure is logical, and the writing is appropriately organized around the central theme. Readers can clearly understand the author's intent.	The overall structure is logical, but not always clear. The writing is organized, but multiple themes are identifiable.	The overall structure is identifiable only with effort, and the writing is scattered and unfocused. Readers cannot follow the logic in many parts.	The overall structure is neither logical nor clear, and the writing is extremely unorganized. Readers cannot follow the logic in most parts.
Grammar	Free or almost free of grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	A few grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	Noticeable but acceptable grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	Numerous grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	An unacceptable number of grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.
Citations and References	Facts and sources supporting claims are consistently and correctly cited in APA style.	Facts and sources supporting claims are mostly correctly cited.	Facts and sources supporting claims are moderately cited, but some statements lack sufficient evidence.	Facts and sources supporting claims are rarely cited, with omissions and errors in many parts.	Facts and sources supporting claims are not cited or are false.
Format	Meets all requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Meets most requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Partially meets the requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Barely meets the requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Does not meet the requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.

* Format of Undergraduate's Thesis

a. Title Page
b. Certification Page (indicating that the Undergraduate's Thesis contains only original and/or properly referenced material)
c. Acknowledgments (for any support and advice received)
d. Executive Summary
e. Table of Contents (should describe the contents in sufficient detail)
f. List of Tables/Figures/Appendices
g. Main Text (e.g., Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Data Analysis and Finding)
h. Conclusions
i. References
j. Appendices (supporting materials in addition to the text, if any)

The length of an Undergraduate's Thesis, including main text, footnotes, references and any appendices, shall be approximately 7,000-15,000 words. However, the length may vary depending on the discipline and shall be set by the Division.

APM Undergraduate Project Rubric

Assessor:

Student's Name:

Student's ID:

Criteria	Very Good	Good	Poor
Description of the Project	The project's objective is very clear and understandable to those outside the field.	The project's objective is somewhat clear and understandable to those outside the field.	The project's objective is not clear and difficult to understand to those outside the field/ the project description is missing.
Significance of the project	Importance and relevance to the field are clearly justified.	Importance and relevance to the field are somewhat justified, but need modifications.	Importance and relevance to the field are not justified.
Process/ Methodology	Process/ methodology is clearly defined and appropriate for the project to meet the objective	Process/methodology is somewhat defined and appropriate for the project to meet the objective.	Process/methodology is not defined or inappropriate for the project to meet the objective.
Integration of Knowledge	Demonstrates advanced application of management knowledge and tools, supported by strong reasoning and evidence /data.	Demonstrates sufficient application of management knowledge and tools, supported by reasonably balanced reasoning and evidence/data.	Shows little to no application of management knowledge and tools, with limited reasoning and evidence/data.
Creativity and nnovativeness	The project shows excellent creativity and innovativeness which gives value, effectiveness and efficiency to the industry/ sector/stakeholder.	The project shows moderate creativity and is distinct from other projects, representing a viable approach in the field.	The project shows little or no creativity/ innovativeness.
Substance/amount of workload/effort	Clearly demonstrates the amount of workload/effort that is equivalent to undergraduate research for the positive learning outcome.	Sufficiently demonstrates the amount of workload/effort that somewhat is equivalent to undergraduate research for the positive learning outcome.	Fails to demonstrate the amount of workload/effort that is equivalent to undergraduate research for the positive learning outcome.

APM Independent Final Report/ Industry Analysis Rubric

Assessor:

Student's Name:

Student's ID:

Criteria	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Good (3)	Poor (2)	Poor (0-1)
Introduction	Clearly and eloquently identifies a subject central theme in a persuasive/ interesting way.	Identifies a subject central theme adequately.	Identifies a subject central theme but unclear in some parts.	A subject central theme can be discerned with difficulties.	Does not identify subject central theme.
Review of study context/ industry	Skillfully identifies and comprehends sources of information closely related to the problem/ issue, or context of study.	Shows a good grasp of sources and of their parts related to the problem/ issue, or context of study.	Makes an effort to identify sources and of their parts related to the problem/ issue, or context of study.	Shows poor grasp of sources and of their parts somewhat related to the problem/issue, or context of study.	Shows very poor grasp of sources and of their parts, completely unrelated to the problem/issue, or context of study.
Methodology	Data collection method is very well written/ conducted and highly appropriate for the type of study.	Data collection method is moderately well written/ conducted and appropriate for the type of study.	Partial description of data collection method is stated and somewhat unclear.	Incomplete and little description of data collection method is stated.	Does not describe method.
Analysis and Integration of Knowledge	Shows critically and accurately analysis with very good application of business and management knowledge/tools. Needs little or no refinement.	Shows reasonably analysis with good application of business and management knowledge/tools but needs some refinements.	Shows partially analysis with an effort of business and management knowledge/tools application and from time to time there is inconsistent in analysis.	Analysis is minimally sufficient or incomplete. Hardly see the application of business and management knowledge/tools.	Analysis and application of business and management knowledge/tools are absence.
Finding	Key findings are comprehensively and clearly discussed in an original way.	Key findings are reasonably discussed but need some refinements.	Key findings are fairly or partially discussed. There are unclear and inconsistent with the analysis in some parts.	Key findings are poorly discussed. Important components are missing.	Fails to discuss key findings.
Conclusions and Recommendation	Draws conclusions, points out shortcomings, and sets out original recommendations.	Concludes main points reasonably well, identifies shortcomings and provides some relevant recommendations.	Summarizes but by mostly repeats what has been presented in the text. Provides few recommendations.	The conclusion and recommendation are discernible only with an effort.	There is no conclusion or no recommendations.

Criteria	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Good (3)	Poor (2)	Poor (0-1)
Overall Structure	The overall structure is extremely logical and clear. The writing is clearly organized around the central theme, allowing readers to easily follow the logic.	The overall structure is logical, and the writing is appropriately organized around the central theme. Readers can clearly understand the author's intent.	The overall structure is logical, but not always clear. The writing is organized, but multiple themes are identifiable.	The overall structure is identifiable only with effort, and the writing is scattered and unfocused. Readers cannot follow the logic in many parts.	The overall structure is neither logical nor clear, and the writing is extremely unorganized. Readers cannot follow the logic in most parts.
Grammar	Free or almost free of grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	A few grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	Noticeable but acceptable grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	Numerous grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	An unacceptable number of grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.
Citations and References	Facts and sources supporting claims are consistently and correctly cited in APA style.	Facts and sources supporting claims are mostly correctly cited.	Facts and sources supporting claims are moderately cited, but some statements lack sufficient evidence.	Facts and sources supporting claims are rarely cited, with omissions and errors in many parts.	Facts and sources supporting claims are not cited or are false.
Format	Meets all requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Meets most requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Partially meets the requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Barely meets the requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Does not meet the requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.

* Format of Independent Final Report/Industry Analysis Report

a. Title Page
b. Certification Page (indicating that the Undergraduate's Project contains only original and/or properly referenced material)
c. Acknowledgments (for any support and advice received)
d. Executive Summary
e. Table of Contents (should describe the contents in sufficient detail)
f. List of Tables/Figures/Appendices
g. Main Text (e.g., Introduction, Review of study context/industry, Data collection, Analysis and Finding)
h. Conclusion and Recommendation
i. References
j. Appendices (supporting materials in addition to the text, if any)

The length of an Independent Final Report/Industry Analysis Report, including main text, footnotes, references and any appendices, shall be approximately 5,000-10,000 words. However, the length may vary depending on the discipline and shall be set by the Division.

APM Business Plan/ Startup Proposal Rubric

Assessor:

Student's Name:

Student's ID:

Criteria	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Good (3)	Poor (2)	Poor (0-1)
Business/ Startup Description	The business/new venture idea is clearly discussed in a compelling and creative manner, including the reason for starting, vision, mission, objectives, business focus, value proposition, and product and/or service offerings.	The business/new venture idea is adequately discussed, with the majority of key components included.	The business/new venture idea is partially discussed, but many key components are unclear.	The business/new venture idea is poorly discussed, with many key components missing.	No business /startup description is provided.
Industry/ Market Analysis	Provides a complete and comprehensive industry/market analysis, including size and maturity, opportunities and threats, overall industry/market outlook, and major competitors. Clearly explains what makes the proposed business/new venture idea different from others.	The industry/ market analysis is nearly complete and appropriate, including the majority of key components. Explains what makes the proposed business/new venture idea different from others.	The industry/ market analysis is somewhat incomplete, with many parts unclear. Fairly explains what makes the proposed business/new venture idea different from others.	The industry/market analysis is mostly incomplete, with many key parts missing. Does not explain what makes the proposed business/new venture idea different from others.	No industry/ market analysis is provided.
Management Team	The form of business (e.g., sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation) and management team are clearly defined, with clear reasons provided for the choice of ownership structure and management team composition.	The form of business and management team are defined, and the reasons for the choice of ownership structure and management team composition are somewhat clear, but require some modifications.	The form of business and management team are selected, but explanations regarding the ownership structure and/or management team composition are unclear.	The form of business and management team are selected, but no reasons are provided.	The form of business and management team are not included in the business plan/startup proposal.
Marketing Plan	Clearly defines the target market and comprehensively discusses the marketing mix, pricing, distribution, promotion, and a compelling USP.	The potential target market is adequately defined, and the marketing mix and USP are discussed, but require some modifications.	The potential target market is adequately defined, and the marketing mix and USP are discussed, but require some modifications.	The potential target market is defined with effort, and the marketing mix and USP are partially discussed. Many parts are unclear or missing.	No potential target market definition and no marketing plan have been developed.

Criteria	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Good (3)	Poor (2)	Poor (0-1)
Operations Plan	Resources and tasks required to realize the proposed business/startup plan are provided concretely and thoroughly. Execution methods are discussed comprehensively and thoroughly.	Some required resources and tasks to realize the proposed business/startup plan are provided, and execution methods are discussed appropriately.	Resources and tasks required to realize the proposed business/startup plan are provided, but some parts require modifications. Execution methods are discussed somewhat.	Resources and tasks required to realize the proposed business/startup plan are partially provided, with necessary resources and/or tasks missing. Execution methods are barely discussed.	Required resources and tasks are not provided, and execution methods are not discussed.
Financial Plan and Risk Mitigation	Comprehensive startup costs are included, and sales forecasts, revenue forecasts, and risk mitigation are clearly provided for a specific period.	Startup costs are included, and sales forecasts, revenue forecasts, and risk mitigation are provided appropriately, but require some modifications.	Startup costs, sales forecasts, revenue forecasts, and risk mitigation are partially provided, but inaccurate or unclear in many parts.	Startup costs, sales forecasts, revenue forecasts, and risk mitigation are inaccurate and make little sense. Risk mitigation is missing.	No startup costs, sales forecasts, revenue forecasts, or risk mitigation are provided.
Overall Structure	The overall structure is extremely logical and clear. The writing is clearly organized around the central theme, allowing readers to easily follow the logic.	The overall structure is logical, and the writing is appropriately organized around the central theme. Readers can clearly understand the author's intent.	The overall structure is logical, but not always clear. The writing is organized, but multiple themes are identifiable.	The overall structure is identifiable only with effort, and the writing is scattered and unfocused. Readers cannot follow the logic in many parts.	The overall structure is neither logical nor clear, and the writing is extremely unorganized. Readers cannot follow the logic in most parts.
Grammar	Free or almost free of grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	A few grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	Noticeable but acceptable grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	Numerous grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.	An unacceptable number of grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors.
Citations and References	Facts and sources supporting claims are consistently and correctly cited in APA style.	Facts and sources supporting claims are mostly correctly cited.	Facts and sources supporting claims are moderately cited, but some statements lack sufficient evidence.	Facts and sources supporting claims are rarely cited, with omissions and errors in many parts.	Facts and sources supporting claims are not cited or are false.
Format	Meets all requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Meets most requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Partially meets the requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Barely meets the requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.	Does not meet the requirements set by the Faculty Council Meeting.

*Format of Business Plan

a. Title Page
b. Certification Page (indicating that the Undergraduate's Project contains only original and/or properly referenced material)
c. Acknowledgments (for any support and advice received)
d. Executive Summary
e. Table of Contents (should describe the contents in sufficient detail)
f. List of Tables/Figures/Appendices
g. Business/Startup Description
h. Industry/Market Analysis
i. Management Team
j. Marketing Plan
k. Operation Plan
l. Financial Plan and Risk Mitigation
m. Business Model (e.g., Business Model Canvas if any)
n. References
o. Appendices (supporting materials in addition to the text, if any)

The length of a Business Plan/Startup Proposal, including main text, footnotes, references and any appendices, shall be approximately 4,000-8,000 words. However, the length may vary depending on the discipline and shall be set by the Division.

APM Innovative and Creative Project Rubric

Assessor:

Student's Name:

Student's ID:

Criteria	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Good (3)	Poor (2)	Poor (0-1)
Originality	Excellent use of new ideas and originality. All ideas, methods, and implementation of the project are unique, successfully breaking rules and conventions	Good use of new ideas and originality. Originality is applied to many parts of the project.	Utilizes some new ideas, but originality is applied to only limited parts of the project.	Hardly uses any new ideas. The project improves upon other people's ideas/ projects.	No new ideas or originality at all. Copies other people's ideas, data, and methods without giving credit.
Creativity	The project shows excellent creativity in design. The project is unique, does not look like the others, with creativity work, exciting and fresh.	The project shows good creativity in design. Many original and creative touches are added to the project, it seems fresh and different from others.	The project shows moderate creativity in design. A few original and creative touches are added to the project, and somewhat not identical with other projects	The project shows little or poor creativity in design. The project is similar to other existing projects.	The project shows no creativity in design.
Innovativeness	The project introduces revolutionary changes/improvements that provide value, effectiveness, and efficiency to the industry/sector/stakeholders.	The project introduces good changes/improvements to current practices, which are appropriately adopted by the industry/sector/stakeholders.	The project introduces moderate changes/improvements to current practices, which people might consider as part of the industry/ sector/stakeholders.	The project introduces little change/improvement to current practices. Generally provides little value to the industry/sector/stakeholders.	The project introduces no changes/improvements to current practices.
Applicability, Feasibility, and Prototype	The project is feasible, adaptable to existing system/market. The prototype is presented.	The project is achievable by spending a fair amount of money and time to develop. The prototype is not presented but could feasibly develop.	The project is somewhat costly to develop and time consuming for existing system/market to adapt. The prototype could be developed with extensive work.	The project is difficult to achieve. It is costly to develop and time consuming for existing system/ market to adapt.	The project is not achievable and unrealistic in real situation.
Budgeting and Risks	Project budget and justification are carefully and thoroughly explained. Risks are minimized.	Project budget and justification are explained adequately, but require some modifications. Risks outweigh the benefits of the project's outcomes.	Project budget and justification are partially explained, with several key relevant costs missing. Risks are mentioned, but are unclear.	Project budget and justification are poorly explained, with many important relevant costs missing. Risks outweigh the benefits of the project's outcomes.	Project budget and justification are not included. Risks are not mentioned.

Criteria	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Good (3)	Poor (2)	Poor (0-1)
Impact	The project has a significant and clear positive impact on the industry/sector /stakeholders.	The project has a moderate impact on the industry/ sector/stakeholders.	The project has a limited impact on the industry/sector/stakeholders.	The project has an unclear and poorly defined impact on the industry/ sector /stakeholders.	The project has no impact on the industry/sector/ stakeholders.