

---

# ASSESSMENT OF ADVOCACY SKILLS OF STUDENTS IN THE FACULTY OF LAW

---

**Besa Arifi**

South East European University, Faculty of Law, Ilindenska, 335, 1200 –  
Tetovo, RM.

E-mail: b.arifi@seeu.edu.mk

DOI: [10.1515/seeur-2015-0027](https://doi.org/10.1515/seeur-2015-0027)

## Abstract

This article aims to present the main findings of a small scale project developed with third year students of the Faculty of Law at South East European University regarding assessment of advocacy skills. The author who works as an assistant professor in the Faculty of Law has developed a pilot project aiming to create a new methodology on assessment. Advocacy skills represent the main learning outcome for law students in different universities. Oral assessment in faculties of law has evolved in interesting ways thoroughly described in this article. The aim of this pilot project was to establish an objective and comprehensive methodology of assessment that includes oral presentations of case studies as well as oral assessment in the final exam. The author explains the challenges faced during the development of this pilot project and the creation of assessment rubrics. The author discusses the results of the project and gives an explanation of the way the project was developed and conducted. The conclusions and the recommendations given at the end discuss the importance of development of oral assessment techniques and provide certain insight information regarding the experience of teaching in the Faculty of Law. The author argues that oral assessment should be regarded as a very important asset which needs to be developed further with the aim of providing students the possibility to gain effective advocacy skills during their education.

## 1. Introduction

Scholars argue that oral assessment dominated assessment up until at least the 18th century at Oxford and Cambridge and continues to be a principal mode of assessment in many European countries. What makes the assessment 'oral' is that at least part of the assessment, and part of what counts towards a student's mark or grade, depends on what the student communicates by word of mouth (Joughin, *A Short Guide to Oral Assessment*, 2010, p. 1).

Advocacy skills combined with legal argumentation are the most important skills to be developed by law students. Their future careers' success very much depends on how prepared they are to convince the eligible persons of their case. Therefore, it is very important that these skills are part of the learning outcomes in the curricula of law faculties.

In coordination with the Quality Office of SEEU, a pilot project was developed aiming at finding the most suitable means of oral assessment of advocacy skills. The pilot project involved one teacher of the Faculty of Law (Besa Arifi) and two small groups of 3<sup>rd</sup> year students (the Albanian and Macedonian speaking groups in Skopje campus that consist of 12-15 students) who attended the course Criminology & Penology.

Specifically the oral assessment of advocacy skills was planned to consist of two parts:

1. Assessment of oral presentations of students during the semester. It was planned that students work in pairs on a topic agreed with the teacher and develop that topic from two different aspects. During the presentation, they were each to give arguments regarding the case. This was supposed to help them develop the argumentation skills that are so important for lawyers who will be practicing law, especially having in mind the adversarial nature of the new criminal procedure of Macedonia. The oral presentations of the students were evaluated through rubrics that included marks for knowledge and understanding, appliance of knowledge, time management, articulation of arguments and legal reasoning. Trial presentations were organized in order for the students to understand the nature of the assessment of these skills that were followed by the presentation itself, which counted for 12% of their final grade.
2. Oral assessment of students in their final exam. At the moment the students take exclusively written exams in this Faculty. The idea of this pilot project was to initiate a change in this direction. If the students

agreed, they would be orally assessed on their final exam for 50% of their final grade. The oral assessment would take place during the exam session. Each student would be interrogated by the professor who would assess mainly their knowledge and understanding of the subject, application of this knowledge in given situations as well as legal argumentation regarding the discussed issues. The answers would be recorded and some of them would be shared with another professor of the same subject in order to get a second opinion on the given mark. This would also cover a part of the peer evaluation of students.

The expected outcomes of this pilot project included:

- better use of presentations and case studies, which are already used as credits for the students, however, with no rubrics or clear evaluation criteria;
- active involvement of students in presentations (separate marking rubrics were filled by listening students) which would promote the “flipping the classroom” technique;
- introduction of oral assessment of the final exam as well as peer evaluation as two very important and internationally recognized assessment techniques.

The results of this pilot project will be presented and evaluated in the following sections, which discuss the literature review, the results of the project and the recommendations.

## **1. Literature review**

This part analyzes some of the most recent and useful literature regarding oral assessment in contemporary higher education institutions especially concerning legal education.

Firstly, Gordon Joughin from the Leeds Metropolitan University explains several advantages of oral assessment:

1. It is the best way to assess particular learning outcomes or abilities
2. It allows probing of the depth and extent of students' knowledge
3. It reflects the world of practice

4. It improves the quality of student learning
5. It suits some students (especially law students – note of the author of this text)
6. Unclear or ambiguous questions can be re-expressed or immediately clarified
7. It guarantees the work is the student's own (Joughin, *A Short Guide to Oral Assessment*, 2010, p. 5)

Furthermore, Joughin establishes six dimensions of planning oral assessment:

1. What is being assessed?
2. Interaction
3. Structure
4. Authenticity
5. Who assesses?

Purely oral or a combination of modes? (Joughin, *A Short Guide to Oral Assessment*, 2010, pp. 10-12)

Joughin discusses the importance of oral assessment in general terms of higher education policies, whereas the following authors discuss this issue specifically regarding legal studies.

Namely, Rowena Cantley-Smith explains that:

“The ability to converse on complex legal and related issues with fluency, accuracy and effectiveness is not only desirable, but virtually mandatory to a successful professional life as a lawyer. This is immediately evident when reflecting upon the professional legal environment in which many new law graduates will find themselves... In such circumstances, it is surprising to discover that oral communication skills are rarely included in the curriculum of many law schools.” (Cantley-Smith, 2006, p. 32).

This author comes to a very specific conclusion that reflects the situation in many law schools and the self-evident need for substantial changes in the assessment methodology:

“Moving to oral assessment methods will require a significant change in the way law students and teachers operate. Admittedly, ensuring the success of any changes to the current ingrained assessment methods may require further training for law teachers, at all levels, in the development of teaching and assessment of oral skills. Such changes would also require further education of law students to enable them to better appreciate the long-term benefits that would flow to them as a result of such assessment processes. Additional training and education should not be seen as a barrier to increasing the use of this kind of assessment in law units. On the contrary, arguably, it is time to consider the appropriateness and relevance of unit design and assessment strategies currently employed for undergraduate law units. There is a need for a reassessment of assessment methods utilized in law schools. Law students must be encouraged to put down their pens from time to time and actively engage in lifelong learning activities, especially those which better equip them with universally important professional skills such as oral communication.” (Cantley-Smith, 2006, pp. 56-57)

Furthermore, Andrea Anne Curcio also argues that:

“Oral communication skills are indisputably a key component of effective lawyering. Yet, in most doctrinal courses, students seldom are assessed on their ability to integrate issue spotting and legal analysis into an oral communication format. Professors could utilize simulated client interviews or counselling exercises to assess students’ ability to analyze and orally communicate their analyses.” (Curcio, 2009, p. 908)

Other authors discuss similar issues regarding the utilization of oral assessment techniques in legal studies and the need for re-thinking the way of assessing the knowledge, skills and abilities of the law students. A common point of all these authors is the lack of satisfaction with conventional methods of assessment and the urgent need for providing better opportunities for law students to gain skills and abilities that they will find useful in their everyday lives as practicing lawyers.

## **2. Methodology, conduct and results of the project**

This part analyzes the way the project was conducted and explains the reason why the specific subject was chosen, the characteristics of the groups of students involved in the project, and the methodology under which the project was conducted and the results.

### *1.1. Choosing the subject and the student groups*

In the spring semester of the academic year 2014/2015 when this project was conducted, the scheduled workload of the author of this paper consisted of teaching four different courses: Cyber crime (elective course taught to a merged group of 86 second year law and criminalistics students), Penology (core course, 45 second year criminalistics students), Victimology (core course, 31 third year criminalistics students) and Criminology & Penology (elective course taught in Albanian with 12 third year students and in Macedonian with 15 third year students in SEEU campus in Skopje). In coordination with the Quality Assurance Office, it was decided that the two groups of students in the campus in Skopje were fitting for such a project for two reasons:

- the groups were small and therefore the results would be immediately visible;
- the groups consisted of third year law students – while oral communication skills are equally important for both law and criminalistics students, it is well-known that law students will have to deal with oral argumentation more frequently in their future professions in comparison with criminalistics students. Therefore, a small group of law students was seen as convenient for developing the project on oral assessment.

While choosing the course that would be the object of the pilot project, it was established that Criminology & Penology was fit for such a process having in mind the different topics discussed in this course: organized crime, violent crimes and domestic violence, economic and white collar crime, penitentiary systems and the system of sanctions in RM and rights and obligations of inmates. The mentioned topics provide good opportunities for the students to discuss separate cases known in history and in law as well as to build argumentations for different legal situations.

### *1.2. The methodology of conducting the project*

The project was explained to the students in the beginning of the semester. In the first introductory class, where the syllabus of the course was explained in details, the components of the final grade were specifically emphasized:

**Table 1. General description of assessment (Besa Arifi, Syllabus Criminology & Penology)**

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>%</b>
Classroom activity	8
Orally presented case-study	12
Mid-term exam	30
Final exam	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

It was explained to the students that they would be orally assessed for a part of their final grade. While assessing the classroom activity is a separately important topic that also falls into oral assessment, the main goal for this project was to establish a methodology of assessment of oral presentations and possibly develop a methodology of oral assessment of the final exam.

1. The oral presentation of a seminar work or case study is not un-known to the students or to the professors of this institution. Namely, they have had similar methods of assessment in many other courses. The idea in this course was to introduce the students to a new method of assessment of the oral presentation, which consisted of the following phases:
  - First, the students would think of a possible topic for their research for which they would be able to prepare an argument for or against in collaboration with a colleague. This would give the students two possibilities: to research a topic of their interest without being limited by the choice of the professor, and further, they would have the opportunity to work in a team and build their teamwork skills. All of these skills: analytical and critical thinking, as well as teamwork and cooperation are important learning outcomes that are already established in the course syllabus.
  - The team that selected a topic in this way would appoint a meeting with the professor during consultation hours where they would explain to the professor as their mentor the topic of their research and the core arguments for and against. The professor would explain the assessment methodology, which consists of a trial presentation, an actual presentation and a rubric of marking. In this way the transparency of the process would be assured and the students would know in advance the way of their assessment as well as have the chance to familiarize themselves with the rubric for oral assessment.
  - The team would work on their case study for one to three weeks and they would do the trial-presentation in front of the professor and would get

feedback about eventual major mistakes or insufficiencies of their work. In this way the students would have the chance to work on their learning outcomes, which consist of knowledge and understanding, application of knowledge and understanding, decision making, communication skills as well as learning abilities.

- The team would then have the actual presentation in front of the students. They would be encouraged to use technology in their presentation upon previously given instructions about the way the presentation should look like (number of slides, organization and appearance of slides, etc.). They would be marked by a previously established and explained rubric (see appendix 1). The rubric would be completed separately for every student participating in the team. The rubric would also be completed separately for every student by other student colleagues who would also be able to assess the work of their peers. This enabled all students to be part of assessment and to participate actively in the presentation as active listeners and as possible questioners of the presenters.
  - Finally, an additional meeting with the students would take place after their actual presentation where they would be given feedback on their work, the points gained by the presentation would be explained to them and the results of the student assessment would be discussed with them. The professor makes the final allocation of points based on the results from the rubric of the marking scheme. This final step re-assures the transparency of the assessment process, as the students know precisely what they have done right or wrong.
2. On the other hand, oral assessment in the final exam has grown to be a distinct rarity in the Faculty of Law where the mid-term and final exams are regularly taken in written form. It is possible to say that there are no final exams that are conducted orally in this faculty. Having in mind that 80% of the final grade of the law students is created through mid-term and final exams (as shown in Table 1) it can be reasonably concluded that the major part of the assessment of law students is written. It is well known that communication and advocacy skills are precious skills that a law student must learn in their studies, however, with this kind of assessment, it remains almost impossible to evaluate. Oral assessment in final exams is well known to professors that come from any ex-socialist university program in the region, since at that time, final exams in the law faculty were 90% taken orally. However, the contemporary methodology of final exams assessed orally differs substantially from that of the ex-socialist higher education systems. For example, at the time the author was a BA student (years 2000-2003, Faculty of Law “Iustinianus Primus” UKIM,



Skopje), the final exams were taken orally in a classroom or lecture hall, where the public would consist of students either answering to that exam the same day, or just present to see how the exam is conducted. The professor would give 3 questions to each student who had applied to take the exam. The student would prepare a short concept note for his needs, and would begin answering the questions. The professor would pose additional clarifying questions. At the end, the professor would give a grade to the student based on his perception on the knowledge and understanding of the student. It was only this learning outcome that was checked and no particular rubrics or procedure existed regarding the assessment itself. On the other hand, the aim of the project explained in this article was to develop a methodology that would make oral assessment in final exams possible based in principles of providing maximal challenge to the students to orally express their knowledge, understanding, application of knowledge, analytical and critical thinking and decision making, as well as guarding the transparency and evidenced assessment as an extremely important ethical rule of assessment. In this regard, the students were informed in the very first class, while discussing the syllabus, about the possibility of taking the final exam orally. They were explained the rules of that final assessment which consisted of the following:

- The final exam would consist of five different questions for the student, each containing 10 maximum points. Additional clarifying questions would be asked by the professor to check the depth of knowledge and understanding as well as to check the ability of the student to think critically and make their own judgment. A separate rubric of assessment scheme would be provided for the final exam, which would have the specific possibilities for grading precisely each answer and each learning outcome (see Appendix 2). This rubric would be discussed beforehand with the students in order for them to know exactly which skills and knowledge would be assessed in their final exam.
- The students would enter the final exam separately and the exam would be conducted between the student and the professor acting as an examiner. However, the answers of the students would be recorded in a voice recorder with the aim of providing evidence about the given questions and the quality of answers. In written exams this kind of evidence is easier to provide (through the written test), however, in oral exams, if there is no recording, there can be room left for complaints that the answers were not properly assessed and irregularities have occurred. Therefore, recording the answers is crucial for ensuring the transparency of this process.

- A selection of recoded answers, possibly one of the best, one of the medium and one of the poor answers, would be shared with a professor of the same field: e.g. Prof. dr Vlado Kambovski, Prof. dr Ragip Halili or Prof. dr Ismail Zejneli. This would be a second check on the transparency of the oral exam; furthermore, it would also provide a way of peer assessment, which is another important focus of the SEE University.

This methodology was developed in coordination with the Quality Assurance Office and was explained in details to the students in their introductory class in the beginning of the semester. The students were asked about their opinion and about their compliance with the pilot project. Their answers will be discussed in the following subtitle.

### **3. The results**

The students were given time to think about this project and to decide whether they wanted to be assessed in this way or not. Since it was a pilot project, which would result in real grades at the end of the semester, it was very important for it to be conducted in accordance with the will of the students.

The students agreed regarding the methodology of assessment of their presentations of case studies. This was regarded as a process with minimal risks for them and its objectivity was saluted. On the other hand, they were sceptical regarding the final exam assessed orally according to the proposed methodology. The author will discuss this issue later in this section.

#### *3.1. Results of oral assessment of case study presentations*

The rubric presented in Appendix 1 was developed early in the semester and it was presented to the students in class and was posted in the LIBRI learning management system. It was welcomed by the students, which showed understanding of the criteria to be assessed.

Groups of students began to form and by the middle of the semester, every student was part of a team that would research a separate topic regarding criminology or penology. Separate meetings with each group were conducted during consultation hours where the research topic was discussed and separate roles were given to the members of the team.

After a considerable time, the trial presentations took place and final remarks were given to team members in order to avoid major mistakes or insufficiencies.

During the actual presentations, each listening student was provided with a copy of the rubric of assessment and they were asked to listen carefully to the presentation and give their mark in the rubric sheets which were then collected by the professor who also sat with the students and listened to the presentation while marking the points in her own assessment rubric.

The presenting students were asked questions in the end of their presentation both by the professor and their other colleagues.

In the additional meeting with the students, the results of the rubrics were discussed and their final points were given. There were no complaints regarding the assessment whereas the students welcomed the objectivity of the process. The students were given points from 0 to 12 depending on their results.

There was one team presentation per week that took place during the second hour of the class, while during the first hour regular lectures were provided by the professor.

In this regard, it can be said that the part of the oral assessment of case study presentations went quite well as planned in the original pilot project.

### *3.2. Results in oral assessment on the final exam*

In this part the students were considerably reserved. While the expectations were very high considering the numerous complaints of the students that the faculty does not provide sufficient chances for the students to develop their advocacy skills, the students of these two groups were very hesitant to the idea of creation of 70% of their grade by oral assessment. The methodology of oral assessment in the final exam was explained in details to the students in the first class, and they were given sufficient time to decide whether they want to be assessed with that methodology or not. They were especially sceptical of the idea of recording their answers as well as the possibility of sharing them with another professor. While discussing oral assessment in the final exam, they were thinking more of an informal environment where they would be asked three or four questions in the presence of a small group of students. It was thoroughly explained to them that the importance of recording their answers and possibly sharing them with other teachers is in compliance with the transparency of the process, which is the only aim of the recording,

however, this sounded stressful and frightening to the students. They were more confident in their well-known field of written responses, especially having in mind that they were third year students with no earlier experience of oral assessment in final exams.

After several weeks of considerations, the students decided to opt for the written final exam instead of oral assessment. In this regard, unfortunately, this part of the pilot project was not implemented as planned.

#### **4. Obstacles and challenges**

This part discusses the results of the project and the challenges that were faced during its implementation. It will try to explain the evolution of the attitude of the students and the university towards oral assessment.

In her experience of 11 years as a lecturer in the Faculty of Law, the author has noticed regularly that law students tend to ask for oral assessment as a better and more convenient way of assessment for them. In other words, lawyers are persons whose work consists mostly of talking, persuasion, convincing and argumentation. Therefore, in many cases, the author has had the experience of students persistently asking to be orally assessed during their final exams. In previous years, this has been almost impossible taking into consideration the strict policy of the faculty not to allow oral examination although legal provisions or University regulations did not prohibit this kind of assessment. Furthermore, three years earlier, the author had the experience with a group of students who studied law in Macedonian language and who insisted on being assessed orally in their final exam. When given this opportunity, 70% of that class agreed to be assessed orally and were very satisfied with their experience. The oral examination in that time was not conducted according to this newly developed methodology, the exam was taken in public, with other students present and that was the way of ensuring transparency. However, the aim is to distinguish this attitude of earlier students who were much more eager to undergo oral assessment of their knowledge and skills in comparison to students of later generations. In this regard, it was a surprise to see that no student of this generation agreed to be assessed orally from the very beginning, without even knowing the methodology of assessment. After the students heard the methodology though, they were entirely opposed to it.

Several concerns arise from this situation:

1. It appears that the law students are becoming more and more quiet while they need their oral communication and advocacy skills more than ever having in mind the substantial changes of the legal system in Macedonia.
2. It appears that the policy of having only written exams in the Faculty of Law without oral assessment is over-shadowing the importance of oral assessment. Oral assessment in final exams is not prohibited either by the Bologna system nor SEEU rules and its use should be re-considered.

In addition, there are two other major problems that interfere with the methodology of oral assessment as well as with the results of student assessment and final learning outcomes:

- The workload of the students of the Faculty of Law is not standardized with the workload of the students of other Faculties of Law in the country or region. The number of credits allocated to specific courses is most of the time insufficient and not proportional with the number of allocated classes for that course. This results in insufficient lecturing and practice hours for the professors and students and makes more challenging the possibility of the student being actively involved in the teaching and learning process. (Clarification: lectures are usually given by the professor to a larger group of students in an auditorium or a large classroom and the topics covered in these classes are further discussed by the assistant or the professor and the students in the so-called 'practice hours' that consist of small groups of students (15-20) in small classrooms where the students are actively involved through class discussions and presentations)
- The other serious problem in this regard is the new policy of allocation of students in practice hours of a specific course. There is now this absurd situation where the lecture is provided in a lecture hall with 90 registered students while in the same lecture hall the practice hour is provided again with 90 students. The University needs to consider the importance of discussions and other activities conducted in the small groups of students known as practice hours. These group activities used to be a distinguishing value of this University and a truly important and a fruitful asset to the students who had the opportunity of being involved actively in class and to have oral presentations. These activities were easy to track and students received concrete credits for their efforts. The exclusion of the small groups of practice hours and their replacement with large groups of 90 plus students reduces the possibility for the students being

actively involved and credited for their class participation and presentations, since it is impossible for each of 90 students to present once in the 15 weeks long semester, while on the other hand, their class discussion also goes unnoticed since it is very hard to appoint credits to students in a lecture type class. In this newly created situation, the pilot project on the oral assessment of case studies will have no chance of being implemented and developed into an effective assessment methodology, having in mind the difficulties mentioned above. Moreover, the possibility of implementing oral assessment in the final exam is entirely topic in relation to this newly established policy.

In this regard, the final question would be the following: Are professors and managers of higher education institutions doing enough to encourage learning outcomes in reality or do professors only have them written in their syllabi? In legal sciences, a clear distinction between concepts *de lege ferrende* (the law as it should be) and *de lege lata* (the law as it is) is crucial. In this regard, having learning objectives only on paper which are not taught or assessed thoroughly in reality may be perceived as a bad example by law students who might become in future the creators of laws that look good on paper but are never implemented in practice.

## Conclusions and recommendations

Oral assessment of advocacy skills remains a very important method of assessment in legal studies. The growing use of this methodology in western countries and in internationally highly ranked institutions of higher education, which have been continually focused on written examinations, teaches us how seriously top institutions of this kind take this method of assessment.

Oral assessment can be developed in many forms: through oral presentations of case studies, classroom activity, oral assessment of mid-term or final exams (vivas), improvised moot courts, clinical studies, etc. It is well known that a lawyer with insufficient oral communication and advocacy skills will not be able to survive in a contemporary market economy and legal system.

This institution needs to think and act carefully in this regard and have in mind the learning outcomes for the students that professors have previously agreed to put in their syllabi. In order for these outcomes to be achieved in practice the following recommendations should be taken into consideration:

- Oral assessment in courses taught in the Faculty of Law in SEEU is evident but not sufficient if it is taken into consideration that 80% of the final grade of the students results from written tests. There is more to be done in introducing new forms of oral assessment and make sure that the students understand the importance of these skills and are involved in operating them.
- Most of the professors in this Faculty come from an ex-socialist tradition where oral assessment in final exams has been a well-known method. Developing this tradition and combining it with new criteria regarding ethical and transparency issues would help establish a better methodology of general assessment of the learning outcomes.
- Additional ways of oral assessment of law students are not entirely unknown to these circles. Namely, improvised moot courts or other sessions are frequently organized in this Faculty, however, there must be a well established scheme of appointing credits for these student activities that will reflect transparently in their final grade.
- Rubrics of assessment need to be developed for every student activity. Many professors confuse these rubrics with the criteria of assessment explained in the syllabus. However, it is not the same thing. If the professors manage to develop separate rubrics for assessing class activity of students, oral presentations, written exams, final exams or other contribution of students, this will help them establish an objective assessment system that will help the students as well as the teachers to be more confident and content with the given grades.
- Developing clinical legal education through legal clinics should be a substantial and immediate task of the Faculty of Law. A real legal clinic would provide excellent opportunities to apply in reality the assessment methodologies developed with projects similar to this one.
- Finally, a serious reassessment of the allocation of credits, workload and teaching and learning hours needs to be taken into consideration. Furthermore, the re-establishing of small groups of practice classes is essential for developing any activity of this kind with the students of the Faculty of Law.

The author intends to seek further possibilities of implementing this newly developed methodology since she deeply believes in its fundamental principles and the positive outcomes for the students.

## References:

1. Cantley-Smith, R. (2006). Put Down Your Pen: The Role of Oral Assessment in Undergraduate Law Studies. *James Cook University Law Review* , 30 (13), 30-63.
2. Crucio, A. A. (2009). Assessing Differently and Using Empirical Studies to See If it Makes a Difference: Can Law Schools Do it Better? *Quinnipiac Law Review* , 27, 899-933.
3. Fish, S. (1989). *Doing what comes naturally, Change, Rhetoric and the Practice of Theory in Literature and Legal Studies*. Duke University Press.
4. Joughin, G. (2010). *A Short Guide to Oral Assessment*. Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University/University of Wollongong.
5. Joughin, G. (1998). Dimensions of oral assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* , 23 (4), 367-378.
6. Kelman, M. (1987). *A guide to critical legal studies* . Harvard University Press.



## APPENDIX 1.

### Criminology & Penology: Rubric for Group Presentations

**Doc. d-r Besa Arifi, Faculty of Law, SEEU**

#### Criteria

#### Levels of Achievement

	<b>Sophisticated (3 points each)</b>	<b>Competent (2 points each)</b>	<b>Not Yet Competent (1 point each)</b>
Research			
Quality (e.g. use of varied sources, evaluated and validated sources, accurate information)	Information is accurate; resources are legitimate; resources are varied when appropriate	Information is mostly accurate with only a few minor errors; one resource may be questionable; resources good but not varied enough	Information is unreliable and/or inaccurate; resources are not valid
Content of Presentation			
Effective slides (e.g. coherent, logical progression, well organized, include main points not details, “tell a story”)	Slides clearly aid the speaker in telling a coherent story	For the most part slides are helpful in telling the story with only a few glaring problems	Slides interfere with the story
Communication			
Clarity (e.g. explains ideas well, integrates with slides, clear introduction and conclusion, obvious transitions, doesn’t use jargon, demonstrates knowledge of key points, responds well to questions)	Presentation is coherent, with clear introduction, transitions, language use, and conclusion; speaker demonstrates intimate knowledge of the subject	Presentation is coherent for the most part, but missing 1 or 2 important elements	Presentation lacks coherence
Style (e.g. speaks in sentences, clear enunciation, fluent delivery, well paced, maintains eye contact, fits time requirement, clearly practiced)	Presentation is polished, speaker uses sentences, enunciates well, is fluent in the delivery, maintains an effective pace and eye contact, doesn’t run over allotted time	Presentation is polished, for the most part, but missing 1 or 2 important elements	Presentation is not polished

## APPENDIX 2.

### Criminology & Penology: Grading Rubric for Final Oral Exam

Doc. d-r Besa Arifi, Faculty of Law, SEEU

	A (max. 10 points each) Exemplary	B (max. 8 points each) Competent	C (max. 6 points each) Developing	D/R Insufficient
Dimensions:				
Overall Understanding	Shows a deep/robust understanding of the topic with a fully developed argument per the categories below	Shows a limited understanding of the topic, not quite a fully developed argument per the categories below	Shows a superficial understanding of the topic, argument not developed enough per the categories below	Shows no understanding of the topic and no argument per the categories below
Argument	Clearly articulates a position or argument	Articulates a position or argument that is incomplete or limited in scope	Articulates a position or argument that is unfocused or ambiguous	Does not articulate a position or argument
Evidence	Presents evidence that is <i>relevant and accurate</i>  Presents <i>sufficient</i> amount of evidence to support argument	Presents evidence that is <i>mostly relevant and/or mostly accurate</i>  Presents <i>limited</i> evidence to support argument	Presents evidence that is <i>somewhat inaccurate and/or irrelevant</i> , but corrects when prompted  Does <i>not</i> present <i>enough</i> evidence to support argument, but augments when prompted	Presents <i>a lot of inaccurate and/or irrelevant</i> evidence  Doesn't present enough evidence to support argument, even when prompted repeatedly
Implications	Fully discusses the major implications of the argument or position	Adequately discusses some of the major implications of the position	Discusses minor implications (missing the major ones) OR does not discuss major implications adequately	Doesn't discuss the implications of the argument or position
Prompting	Did not have to prompt with probing questions at all	Prompted minimally (one or two probing questions)	Prompted a lot (a series of probing questions)	