

Appendix 3 - Grading criteria - Assessment 3 (Individual Business Model and Plan) (40%)

Criteria	GCs.	SILOs	Excellent (A 80-100%)	Very Good (B 70-79%)	Good (C 60-69%)	Pass (D 50-59%)	Fail (N 0-49%)	Mark(s)
Discipline knowledge			Disciplinary knowledge is clearly presented. Uses disciplinary language authoritatively; shows critical understanding of the relevant theories, issue presented, demonstrates depth and accuracy of understanding.	Disciplinary knowledge is clearly presented. Uses disciplinary language competently, shows a proficient awareness of the relevant theories, issues, and demonstrates accuracy of understanding.	Disciplinary knowledge is presented. Uses disciplinary language approaching competency, shows an awareness of the issue presented and demonstrates limited content understanding.	Disciplinary knowledge lacks clarity. Uses disciplinary language tentatively, shows an awareness of the issue presented and some evidence of gaining new understanding.	Disciplinary knowledge is unclear. Does not use the language of the discipline in a sustained fashion, and demonstrates no evidence of gaining new understanding.	/5
Critical analysis	Critical Thinking Inquiry/ Research	02	Strategically and critically analyses and evaluates components of the business model, and business model canvas, and the feasibility of the business in terms of the offering, customers, infrastructure, and finance; making justifiable, evidence-based recommendations if relevant.	Strategically and critically analyses and evaluates components of the business model, and business model canvas, and the feasibility of the business in terms of the offering, customers, infrastructure, and finance, with some minor omissions. If relevant, recommendations are evidence-based and justifiable.	Overall, analysis and evaluation show critical thinking but include several gaps. If relevant, recommendations are evidence-based but may not be fully justifiable.	Analysis and evaluation have a number of significant gaps, and/or need further clarification. If relevant, recommendations may not be evidence-based or fully justifiable.	Analysis and evaluation are very superficial and lacking in depths. Recommendations, if relevant, are not evidence-based and/or justifiable.	/20
Independent thought	Autonomy and independence	02	Demonstrates an outstanding original approach and excellent level of independent thinking. Effectively manages time and resources to complete all parts of the task.	Shows good level of independent thinking with an original approach. Completes all required tasks with good use of time and resources.	Shows originality and acceptable level of independent thinking. Some minor parts are incomplete.	Some originality and acceptable level of independent thinking. A number of parts are incomplete and missing evidence of independent thought.	Lack of originality and poor demonstration of independent thinking. Failure to fully complete the task due to ineffective management of time and resources.	/5
Ethical awareness	Ethical behaviour	05	Excellent recognition of the implications for the ethical and value framework when interacting with different values-based perspectives in professional and global concerns.	Very good recognition of the implications for the ethical and value framework when interacting with different values-based perspectives in professional and global concerns.	Acknowledges and engages other ethical and value-based perspectives in professional, societal or global concerns.	Limited engagement with other ethical and value-based perspectives in professional, societal or global concerns.	No engagement with other ethical and value-based perspectives in professional, societal or global concerns.	/5
Writing and Referencing	Writing and Referencing	09	Plan is well structured, with fluent and cohesive presentation of ideas. Sophisticated academic language throughout, with excellent use of supporting evidence. Persuasively addresses the task, and employs a relevant approach. Employs an accurate academic referencing convention citing multiple sources.	Plan is logically structured, with some minor inconsistencies in cohesion and presentation of ideas, and /or grammar and spelling. Sustained use of supporting evidence with a clearly focus on the task. Employs an accurate academic referencing convention citing multiple sources, with some minor errors.	Plan is somewhat logically structured using appropriate academic language, with appropriate use of evidence in addressing the task. Employs a basic academic referencing convention appropriate to the discipline. Includes an adequate number of sources. Several errors in referencing, grammar and/or punctuation.	Attempts logical structure, sighting some evidence, without constructing a clear response to the task. Limited use of appropriate academic language, with a number of grammatical errors. Employs a basic academic referencing convention appropriate to the discipline with limited sources and/or a number of significant errors	The work does not employ a structured approach to the task. The writing is unclear and poorly constructed. Shows unfamiliarity with, and inconsistent application of the conventions of academic referencing with inadequate sources.	/5
COMMENTS								/40

