

May 2006 – Assessment Matrix for TOPCIMA - Zubinos

Criterion	Marks	Clear Pass	Pass	Marginal Pass	Marginal Fail	Fail	Clear Fail
Technical	5	Thorough display of relevant technical knowledge. 5	Good display of relevant knowledge. 4	Some display of relevant technical knowledge. 3	Identification of some relevant knowledge, but lacking in depth. 2	Little knowledge displayed, or some misconceptions. 1	No evidence of knowledge displayed, or fundamental misconceptions. 0
Application	10	Knowledge clearly applied in an analytical and practical manner. 9-10	Knowledge applied to the context of the case. 6-8	Identification of some relevant knowledge, but not well applied. 5	Knowledge occasionally displayed without clear application. 3-4	Little attempt to apply knowledge to the context. 1-2	No application of knowledge displayed. 0
Diversity	5	Most knowledge areas identified, covering a wide range of views. 5	Some knowledge areas identified, covering a range of views. 4	A few knowledge areas identified, expressing a fairly limited scope. 3	Several important knowledge aspects omitted. 2	Many important knowledge aspects omitted. 1	Very few knowledge aspects considered. 0
Focus	15	Clearly distinguishes between relevant and irrelevant information. 13-15	Information used is mostly relevant. 9-12	Some relevant information ignored, or some less relevant information used. 8	Information used is sometimes irrelevant. 5-7	Little ability to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information. 1-4	No ability to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information. 0
Prioritisation	10	Issues clearly prioritised in a logical order and based on a clear rationale. 9-10	Issues prioritised with justification. 6-8	Evidence of issues being listed in order of importance, but rationale unclear. 5	Issues apparently in priority order, but without a logical justification or rationale. 3-4	Little attempt at prioritisation or justification or rationale. 1-2	No attempt at prioritisation or justification. 0
Judgement	15	Clearly recognises alternative solutions. Judgement exercised professionally. 13-15	Alternative solutions or options considered. Some judgement exercised. 9-12	A slightly limited range of solutions considered. Judgement occasionally weak. 8	A limited range of solutions considered. Judgement sometimes weak. 5-7	Few alternative solutions considered. Judgement often weak. 1-4	No alternative solutions considered. Judgement weak or absent. 0
Integration	10	Diverse areas of knowledge and skills integrated effectively. 9-10	Diverse areas of knowledge and skills integrated. 6-8	Knowledge areas and skills occasionally not integrated. 5	Knowledge areas and skills sometimes not integrated. 3-4	Knowledge areas and skills often not integrated. 1-2	Knowledge areas and skills not integrated. 0
Logic	20	Communication effective, recommendations realistic, concise and logical. 16-20	Communication mainly clear and logical. Recommendations occasionally weak. 11-15	Communication occasionally unclear, and/or recommendations occasionally illogical. 10	Communication sometimes weak. Some recommendations slightly unrealistic. 5-9	Communication weak. Some unclear or illogical recommendations, or few recommendations. 1-4	Very poor communication, and/or no recommendations offered. 0
Ethics	10	Excellent evaluation of ethical aspects. Clear and appropriate advice offered. 9-10	Good evaluation of ethical aspects. Some appropriate advice offered. 6-8	Some evaluation of ethical aspects. Advice offered. 5	Weak evaluation of ethical aspects. Little advice offered. 3-4	Poor evaluation of ethical aspects. No advice offered. 1-2	No evaluation of ethical aspects. Unethical, or no, advice offered. 0
TOTAL	100	© CIMA – January 2006					