

**HWA CHONG INSTITUTION**

**CATEGORY 4: RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT [2016]**

**PROJECT MONITORING & EVALUATION**

<b>THE PROJECT [40 marks]</b>			
<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Approaching Expectation</b>	<b>Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectation</b>
<b>Objectives</b>	Objectives are not clearly defined; they are irrelevant and fail to align with the topic. [1]	Objectives are clearly defined, relevant and focused. [2]	Objectives are very clearly defined, relevant and focused. [3]
<b>Target Audience</b>	Target audience has not been identified. [0]	Target audience has not been appropriately identified. [1]	Target audience has been appropriately identified. [2]
<b>Research</b>	Readings and reviews are done in a skimpy manner. [1]	Some appropriate readings and reviews have been done to affirm feasibility of project and provide information for creation of resources. [2] [3]	Very appropriate readings and reviews have been done to affirm feasibility of project and provide information for creation of resources. [4] [5]
<b>Research Etiquette</b>  <b>For T&amp;L packages</b>	Proper procedures are not observed in research; appropriate references and acknowledgement are not indicated.  <i>Content has not been endorsed by relevant subject teacher.</i> [1]	Some proper procedures are observed in research; some appropriate references and acknowledgement are indicated, though not always done correctly.  <i>Content has been endorsed by relevant subject teacher.</i> [2] [3]	Proper procedures are observed in research with appropriate references and acknowledgement clearly and correctly indicated.  <i>Content has been endorsed by relevant subject teacher.</i> [4] [5]
<b>Effort</b>  <b>For T&amp;L packages</b>	Less than 80% of project has been completed.  <i>No video clip included</i> [1]	80% of project has been completed but some improvement is needed.  <i>Video clip is included but improvement is needed</i> [2] [3]	80% of project has been completed with minimal improvement needed.  <i>Video clip is included and is of a very good standard</i> [4] [5]

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Approaching Expectation</b>	<b>Meeting Expectation</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectation</b>
<b>Creativity</b>	Resource package ideas do not show originality of thought; ideas are not creative. [1]	Resource package ideas show some originality of thought; ideas are fairly creative. [2] [3]	Resource package ideas show originality of thought; ideas are creative. [4] [5]
<b>Usefulness</b>	No pilot test has been carried out - unable to confirm that resource package is useful for target users. [1]	Pilot test has been carried out – able to confirm that resource package is somewhat useful for target users. [3] [5]	Pilot test has been carried out – able to confirm that resource package is very useful for target users. [7] [10]
<b>Methodology (for development of resources)</b>	Methodology has not been planned appropriately to reflect timeline and relevant methods; methods used are simple cut-and-paste or repackage of what is already available. [1]	Good and appropriate methodology has been planned to reflect timeline and relevant methods; methods used include a variety of techniques to create and present resource package. [2] [3]	Excellent and appropriate research methodology has been planned for to reflect timeline and relevant methods used include a variety of techniques to create and present resource package. [4] [5]
<b>Speech Delivery</b>	Communication is not very clear or engaging. [1]	Communication is clear and fairly engaging. [2] [3]	Communication is very clear and engaging. [4] [5]
<b>Audience Awareness &amp; Confidence</b>	Presenters lack confidence, read from script and are not able to engage the audience. [1]	Presenters are confident and able to engage the audience to some extent. [2] [3]	Presenters are very confident and able to engage the audience well. [4] [5]
<b>Coherence &amp; Organisation</b>	Data and content are not well-organised. [1]	Data and content are well-organised. [2] [3]	Data and content are very well-organised. [4] [5]
<b>Response to Questions</b>	Questions are not answered with sufficient clarification and group appears defensive. [1]	Questions are answered with some relevant, logical and convincing clarification. [2] [3]	Questions are well-answered with relevant, logical and convincing clarification. [[4] [5]