#### **Rubric: Conducting an Environmental Scan**

Criteria	Professional 10	Experienced 8	Developing 6	Novice 4
Content  The information contained in and communicated by the environmental scan  60 points	☐ Gathered sufficient/current information from a variety of reliable sources.	☐ Gathered adequate/mostly current information, but sources were somewhat limited.	Gathered information, but much of it was outdated, and not all sources were reliable.	☐ Gathered poor quality information.
	☐ Correctly identified relevant, accurate economic information, referencing specific ways this information could impact the business.	☐ With few exceptions, correctly identified relevant, accurate economic information, referencing fairly specific ways this information could impact the business.	Often omitted relevant, accurate economic information or included unimportant information; s/he had trouble referencing ways this information could impact the business.	■ Was not able to identify relevant, accurate economic information.
	☐ Correctly identified relevant, accurate legal information, referencing specific ways this information could impact the business.	☐ With few exceptions, correctly identified relevant, accurate legal information, referencing fairly specific ways this information could impact the business.	Often omitted relevant, accurate legal information or included unimportant information; s/he had trouble referencing ways this information could impact the business.	■ Was not able to identify relevant, accurate legal information.
	☐ Correctly identified relevant, accurate social and cultural information, referencing specific ways this information could impact the business.	☐ With few exceptions, correctly identified relevant, accurate social and cultural information, referencing fairly specific ways this information could impact the business.	Often omitted relevant, accurate social and cultural information or included unimportant information; s/he had trouble referencing ways this information could impact the business.	■ Was not able to identify relevant, accurate social and cultural information.
	☐ Correctly identified relevant, accurate global information, referencing specific ways this information could impact the business.	☐ With few exceptions, correctly identified relevant, accurate global information, referencing fairly specific ways this information could impact the business.	Often omitted relevant, accurate global information or included unimportant information; had trouble referencing ways this information could impact the business.	☐ Was not able to identify relevant, accurate global information.
	☐ Correctly identified relevant, accurate technological information, referencing ways this information could impact the business.	☐ With few exceptions, correctly identified relevant, accurate technological information, referencing fairly specific ways this information could impact the business.	Often omitted relevant, accurate technological information or included unimportant information; s/he had trouble referencing ways this information could impact the business.	☐ Was not able to identify relevant, accurate technological information.

### Business Environmental Scan Project #3

#### **Rubric: Conducting an Environmental Scan**

Criteria	Professional 10	Experienced 8	Developing 6	Novice 4
Communication Skills	☐ Information was clear and easy to understand.	☐ Information was clear with only a few items being difficult to understand.	☐ Information was not clear and took much effort to understand.	☐ Information was too vague to understand.
The ability to express oneself so as to be understood by others	☐ Completed environmental scan was neat, grammatically correct, and error-free.	☐ Completed environmental scan was neat but contained minor errors.	<ul> <li>Completed environmental scan contained spelling and grammatical errors that were distracting.</li> </ul>	☐ Completed environmental scan was messy, with many errors in spelling and grammar.
30 points	☐ The student's targeted business was clearly reflected in the completed environmental scan.	☐ The student's targeted business was, for the most part, reflected in the completed environmental scan.	☐ The student's targeted business was not easily detected in the completed environmental scan.	☐ The student's targeted business was not reflected in the completed environmental scan.
Organization  The way in which the information is put together  10 points	☐ Information presented was logical and easy to follow.	☐ Information presented was generally logical and easy to follow.	☐ Information presented was sometimes difficult to follow.	☐ Information was difficult to follow and illogical.
	☐ Supporting documentation was complete and clearly labeled.	☐ Supporting documentation was clearly labeled, but some items were missing.	☐ Some supporting documentation was missing, and some was inaccurately labeled.	☐ Supporting documentation was not provided.

# Business Environmental Scan Project #3 Rubric: Presentation

Criteria	Professional 8	Experienced 6	Developing 4	Novice 2
Organization  How the information was put together; the flow of the presentation  40 points	☐ Presentation was structured with a definite beginning, middle, and end.	☐ Beginning, middle, and end were present but not clearly identified.	☐ Beginning, middle, or end was difficult to discern.	☐ Beginning, middle, or end was missing.
	☐ The main points were logical with points building on each other.	☐ The main points were generally easy to follow and logical.	☐ The main points were logical but difficult to follow.	☐ The main points were so difficult to follow that their logic could not be determined, or they were illogical.
	☐ Introduction engaged audience and identified video's purpose.	<ul> <li>Introduction was interesting and provided partial explanation of what video was about.</li> </ul>	☐ Standard introduction was presented and hinted at purpose of video.	☐ Introduction was uninteresting and did not identify the video's purpose.
	☐ Material was suited to the length of the presentation.	Material was fairly well suited to the length of the presentation.	☐ Content appeared to be stretched or omitted to fit the length of the presentation.	☐ Too much or too little information was presented in the presentation.
	☐ Presentation came to a suitable conclusion with main points summarized.	☐ Conclusion was satisfying, but not all main points summarized.	☐ Conclusion seemed unsatisfying, or main points were vague.	☐ Presentation ended abruptly without a conclusion or summary of key points.
Content  The information that was shared with the audience 24 points	☐ Presentation presented relevant, accurate, up-to-date information.	☐ Information presented was relevant to the presentation's purpose but was outdated.	☐ Irrelevant information was occasionally presented.	☐ Information presented was unrelated to the presentation's purpose and wandered aimlessly.
	Meaningful supporting information was provided for each key point.	<ul> <li>Unsupported information did not limit understandability of presentation.</li> </ul>	Some information was vague or unsupported by evidence.	☐ Presentation information was vague and lacked supporting evidence.
	☐ Examples were relevant to the audience and the occasion.	☐ Examples were presented but they were not relevant to the audience.	Examples strayed from the purpose of the presentation or required thought to grasp.	☐ Presentation presented dated examples that failed to support its purpose.

## Business Environmental Scan Project #3

Rubric: Presentation (cont'd)

Criteria	Professional 6	Experienced 5	Developing 4	Novice 3
Delivery  How the speaker presented the information  36 points	☐ Presentation was delivered smoothly in a conversational style.	☐ Delivery contained a few unnecessary pauses.	Delivery was filled with dead words such as "uh," "and," or "like."	☐ Presentation was filled with dead words and sounded artificial.
	☐ Speaker pronounced words correctly and clearly, making it easy to understand what was being said.	☐ Speaker enunciated words clearly but mispronounced a few words.	Speaker occasionally mumbled and mispronounced words, making it difficult to understand what was said.	Speaker mumbled and mispronounced words throughout the presentation, making it almost impossible to understand what was said.
	☐ Terminology used in the presentation was familiar or clearly explained.	☐ A few unfamiliar words were used and were not explained; however, their meaning could be understood from context.	Some technical terms were used and were not explained.	<ul> <li>Unexplained technical terms were used throughout the presentation, making the information unclear.</li> </ul>
	☐ Vocal expression, volume, and pace kept the audience hooked.	☐ Vocal expression and pace maintained audience's interest in the presentation; volume was too soft/loud.	☐ Vocal expression sounded artificial; volume was too loud/soft; and the pace of delivery was too fast or too slow.	Speaker spoke in a too soft/loud monotone voice, using a pace that was too fast or too slow to maintain interest.
	☐ Speaker used correct grammar and standard English throughout the presentation.	☐ Speaker used correct grammar, occasionally incorporating slang into the presentation.	Speaker made a few grammatical mistakes and used slang throughout the presentation.	☐ Presentation was hampered by grammatical mistakes and reliance on slang.
	☐ Presentation was supported with clear and easy-to-see visual aids that used correct grammar and spelling.	☐ Presentation had easy-to-see visual aids, but they contained a few spelling or grammar errors.	Presentation s visual aids contained many grammatical and spelling errors and required concentration to see and understand.	Presentation's visual aids were too small/faint/ dark to be seen easily and contained so many spelling and grammatical errors that they detracted from the presentation.