**Rubric for the evaluation of the presentation of the PBL**

The presentation evaluation criteria have been designed following the update of the taxonomy of Bloom (2008) 1.

| **EVALUATION CRITERIA** | **EXCELLENT** | **VERY GOOD** | **GOOD SLIGHTLY** | **ACCEPTABLE** | **INSUFFICIENT** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. They develops an approach and organisation of the presentation of the project and keeps to the presentation time (10').** | The organisation of the project defence is structured and follows a precise thread that concisely synthesises the content of the work. It is in accordance with the time (10') established for the exhibition. | The organisation of the project defence is structured and follows a precise thread that clearly synthesises the content of the work. It is in accordance with the time (10') established for the exhibition. | The organisation of the project defence is well structured. It is in line with the time (10') set for the exhibition. | The organisation of the project defence has problems in the structuring of the presentation of the content of the work. It does not comply with the time (10') established for the exhibition. | Significant problems are detected in the structuring of the defence.  It does not conform to the time (10') established for the exhibition. |
| **5%** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **1-2** | **0** |
| **2. The exhibition is delivered with accurate and appropriate intonation. The vocabulary used is technical and appropriate to the subject of the presentation.** | Intonation is accurate and appropriate. The vocabulary used is technical and appropriate to the subject matter of the exhibition. | Intonation is correct. The vocabulary used is appropriate to the subject of the exhibition. | Intonation shows some errors in accuracy which are not significant for the comprehension of the speech. | Intonation has errors of precision and appropriateness to the discourse. Vocabulary used is non-technical in a high percentage (60-100%). | Intonation is hesitant and hinders the development of speech.  Uses colloquial vocabulary. |
| **5%** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **1-2** | **0** |
| **3. They argue answers to questions posed by the teacher and/or peers about the project.** | Argumentation is confident and precise. The answers are elaborated and imply a thorough mastery of the subject matter of the project. procedural and attitudinal skills seen in the subject. | Argumentation is precise. Answers are elaborated and imply a good command of the subject matter of the project. procedural and attitudinal skills seen in the subject. | The argumentation is correct. The answers are elaborated and imply adequate knowledge of the subject matter of the project. | The argumentation is hesitant to answer the questions put to it. However, the answers are in line with the object of the project. | The argumentation is hesitant to answer the questions put to it. The answers are ambiguous and general. |
| **5%** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **1-2** | **0** |
| **4. They argue final conclusions of the project and future lines of continuity imply a degree of precise and careful elaboration, evaluation and reflection.** | The resources to support the exhibition have been used skilfully and have been carefully prepared. All this has facilitated the didactics of the presentation. | The resources to support the exhibition have been used appropriately. They have been carefully prepared. All this has facilitated the didactics of the presentation. | The resources to support the exhibition have been used correctly. | The resources to support the presentation have not been used skilfully, and there are significant errors in the elaboration, which significantly hinders the didactics of the presentation. | The resources used for the presentation were not carefully prepared. All of which has significantly hindered the didactics of the presentation. |
| **5%** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **1-2** | **0** |

**Rubric for the evaluation of the elaboration of the PBL.**

The evaluation criteria have been designed following the update of the taxonomy of Bloom (2008) 1.

| **EVALUATION CRITERIA** | **EXCELLENT** | **VERY GOOD** | **WELL** | **UNACCEPTABLE** | **INSUFFICIENT** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. They use up-to-date bibliographic references from scientific databases.** | They use up-to-date bibliographic references, in the current course or within four years before, (80 to 100%) in relation to the topic of the chosen project. | They use updated bibliographic references, in the current course or within four years before, (60 to 79%) in relation to the topic of the chosen project. | They use up-to-date bibliographic references, in the current course or within four years before, (40-59%) in relation to the topic of the chosen project. | They do not use updated bibliographic references, in the current course or in an interval of four years before, (less than 30%). | They do not use updated bibliographic references, in the current course or in an interval of four years before, (less than 30%). |
| **5%** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **1-2** | **0** |
| **2. They utilise APA or Vancouver standards accurately and carefully and the writing of the paper involves accurate and careful use of spelling, punctuation using a writing style in the third person singular.** | They utilise APA or Vancouver standards accurately and carefully and the writing of the document involves a precise and careful use of spelling, punctuation using a writing style in the third person singular. | They utilise APA or Vancouver standards carefully and the writing of the document involves a careful use of spelling, punctuation using a writing style in the third person singular. | They utilise APA or Vancouver standards without significant errors and the writing of the document follows the spelling and punctuation rules using a writing style in the third person singular without significant errors. | There are errors in the application of APA or Vancouver standards. Errors are detected in the writing of the document (in the spelling rules, punctuation marks, in the writing agent). | There are significant errors in the use of APA or Vancouver standards. Significant errors are detected in the writing of the manuscript. |
| **5%** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **1-2** | **0** |
| **3. They show a logical structuring of the headings that is made explicit in a precise and systematic organization of the contents and of the intervention proposal using the conceptual, procedural and attitudinal contents seen in the course.** | The structure of the headings follows a logical line that is made explicit in a precise and systematic organization of the contents and of the intervention proposal using the conceptual, procedural and attitudinal contents seen in the course. | The structure of the headings follows a logical line that is made explicit in a systematic organization of the contents and of the intervention proposal using the conceptual, procedural and attitudinal contents seen in the course. | The structuring of the headings follows a logical line that is made explicit in an organization with some errors, not excessively significant, of the contents and of the intervention proposal. It uses some of the conceptual, procedural and attitudinal contents seen in the course. | There are errors in the structuring of the headings and/or in the contents of the intervention proposal. The use of the conceptual, procedural and attitudinal contents seen in the course is scarce. | There are significant errors in the structuring of the headings and/or in the contents of the intervention proposal. They do not use the conceptual, procedural and attitudinal contents seen in the subject. |
| **5%** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **1-2** | **0** |
| **4. They argue final conclusions of the project and future lines of continuity imply a degree of precise and careful elaboration, evaluation and reflection.** | The final conclusions of the project and the future lines of continuity imply a precise and careful degree of elaboration, evaluation and reflection. | The final conclusions of the project and the future lines of continuity imply a degree of careful elaboration, evaluation and reflection. | The final conclusions of the project and future lines of continuity involve a good deal of elaboration, evaluation and reflection. | The final conclusions of the project and the future lines of continuity show shortcomings in the elaboration, evaluation and reflection. | Significant errors can be seen in the conclusions and in the future lines of continuity. |
| **10%** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **1-2** | **0** |
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