**Concentration Seminar – Business Economics**

Research proposal development and presentation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale**  **Score**  **Dimension** | **Unsatisfactory**  **0 - 59** | **Developing**  **60 - 69** | **Satisfactory**  **70 - 79** | **Excellent**  **80 - 100** |
| 1. Proposal reporting | Proposal is badly written and systematically incorrect | Proposal does not follow the required format and there are issues with language and writing | Proposal is written in correct format, however, there are some typos and grammatical mistakes | Proposal is well-written and systematically correct |
| 2. Proposal content | Proposal is only a replication in a mature subject, there is no solid literature review, poorly executed in term of methodology and analysis which then leads to insignificant contribution to academics and practitioners | Proposal is not new in term of topic. Literature review, research method and discussion are flatly executed. No significant contribution neither to academics and practitioners | Proposal is not new in term of topic, however, literature review, research method, discussion are good which could be considered to bring a contribution to the body of knowledge | Proposal is relatively new in term of topic, supported by strong literature review, appropriate research method, deep analysis and discussion as well as provides contribution to the existing literature and noteworthy policy implications |
| 3. Quality of presentation | Student presents the proposal badly, do not understand the subject and could not be able to argue appropriately | Proposal is presented flatly, student does not comprehensively understands the subject, and the argumentation is not appropriate | Proposal is orally presented fluently, student understands the subject, however, argumentation is not clear | Proposal is orally presented excellently, student comprehensively understands the subject and supported by solid arguments |

**Concentration Seminar – Development Planning**

Research proposal development and presentation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale**  **Score**  **Dimension** | **Unsatisfactory**  **0 - 59** | **Developing**  **60 - 69** | **Satisfactory**  **70 - 79** | **Excellent**  **80 - 100** |
| 1. Proposal reporting | Proposal is badly written and systematically incorrect | Proposal does not follow the required format and there are issues with language and writing | Proposal is written in correct format, however, there are some typos and grammatical mistakes | Proposal is well-written and systematically correct |
| 2. Proposal content | Proposal is only a replication in a mature subject, there is no solid literature review, poorly executed in term of methodology and analysis which then leads to insignificant contribution to academics and practitioners | Proposal is not new in term of topic. Literature review, research method and discussion are flatly executed. No significant contribution neither to academics and practitioners | Proposal is not new in term of topic, however, literature review, research method, discussion are good which could be considered to bring a contribution to the body of knowledge | Proposal is relatively new in term of topic, supported by strong literature review, appropriate research method, deep analysis and discussion as well as provides contribution to the existing literature and noteworthy policy implications |
| 3. Quality of presentation | Student presents the proposal badly, do not understand the subject and could not be able to argue appropriately | Proposal is presented flatly, student does not comprehensively understands the subject, and the argumentation is not appropriate | Proposal is orally presented fluently, student understands the subject, however, argumentation is not clear | Proposal is orally presented excellently, student comprehensively understands the subject and supported by solid arguments |

**Concentration Seminar – Resource and Institution Economics**

Research proposal development and presentation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale**  **Score**  **Dimension** | **Unsatisfactory**  **0 - 59** | **Developing**  **60 - 69** | **Satisfactory**  **70 - 79** | **Excellent**  **80 - 100** |
| 1. Proposal reporting | Proposal is badly written and systematically incorrect | Proposal does not follow the required format and there are issues with language and writing | Proposal is written in correct format, however, there are some typos and grammatical mistakes | Proposal is well-written and systematically correct |
| 2. Proposal content | Proposal is only a replication in a mature subject, there is no solid literature review, poorly executed in term of methodology and analysis which then leads to insignificant contribution to academics and practitioners | Proposal is not new in term of topic. Literature review, research method and discussion are flatly executed. No significant contribution neither to academics and practitioners | Proposal is not new in term of topic, however, literature review, research method, discussion are good which could be considered to bring a contribution to the body of knowledge | Proposal is relatively new in term of topic, supported by strong literature review, appropriate research method, deep analysis and discussion as well as provides contribution to the existing literature and noteworthy policy implications |
| 3. Quality of presentation | Student presents the proposal badly, do not understand the subject and could not be able to argue appropriately | Proposal is presented flatly, student does not comprehensively understands the subject, and the argumentation is not appropriate | Proposal is orally presented fluently, student understands the subject, however, argumentation is not clear | Proposal is orally presented excellently, student comprehensively understands the subject and supported by solid arguments |

**Concentration Seminar – Monetary and International**

Research proposal development and presentation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale**  **Score**  **Dimension** | **Unsatisfactory**  **0 - 59** | **Developing**  **60 - 69** | **Satisfactory**  **70 - 79** | **Excellent**  **80 - 100** |
| 1. Proposal reporting | Proposal is badly written and systematically incorrect | Proposal does not follow the required format and there are issues with language and writing | Proposal is written in correct format, however, there are some typos and grammatical mistakes | Proposal is well-written and systematically correct |
| 2. Proposal content | Proposal is only a replication in a mature subject, there is no solid literature review, poorly executed in term of methodology and analysis which then leads to insignificant contribution to academics and practitioners | Proposal is not new in term of topic. Literature review, research method and discussion are flatly executed. No significant contribution neither to academics and practitioners | Proposal is not new in term of topic, however, literature review, research method, discussion are good which could be considered to bring a contribution to the body of knowledge | Proposal is relatively new in term of topic, supported by strong literature review, appropriate research method, deep analysis and discussion as well as provides contribution to the existing literature and noteworthy policy implications |
| 3. Quality of presentation | Student presents the proposal badly, do not understand the subject and could not be able to argue appropriately | Proposal is presented flatly, student does not comprehensively understands the subject, and the argumentation is not appropriate | Proposal is orally presented fluently, student understands the subject, however, argumentation is not clear | Proposal is orally presented excellently, student comprehensively understands the subject and supported by solid arguments |