

## **DISSERTATION AND VIVA VOCE RUBRICS**

The viva voce marks of the dissertation will be given on the basis of viva conducted in presence of External Member & guide.

<b>JHARKHAND RAI UNIVERSITY, RANCHI</b>			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL STUDIES</b>			
<b>DISSERTATION AND VIVA VOCE</b>			
<b>SL NO.</b>	<b>Rubrics for Dissertation and Viva Voce</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Weightage</b>
1	Dissertation Report	50	50%
2.	Research Publication	25	25%
3.	Viva	25	25%
<b>TOTAL MARKS FOR DISSERTATION AND VIVA VOCE</b>		100	100%

<b>Parameters</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
<b>Purpose &amp; objectives (5 Marks)</b>	Exceptionally well stated, interesting, sophisticated, original, full and convincing justification	<b>4-5 marks</b>
	Well stated purpose, appropriate and realistic explanation of the context /problem/case	<b>3-4 marks</b>
	Clearly stated, some relevance, straightforward	<b>2-3 marks</b>
	Not stated, confusing, unrelated to title, difficult to understand, inappropriate study	<b>0-2 marks</b>
<b>Literature Review (10 Marks)</b>	Exceptional section that fully demonstrates a discerning, creative and critical engagement with what has been read	<b>8-10 marks</b>
	Good coverage, awareness of relevant prior research, clear structure, stated selection criteria, consistent referencing, clarity of understanding, the literature, informs and adds to the development of the project /case study	<b>6-8 marks</b>
	A basic coverage of relevant literature. Inconsistent referencing, The literature offers some additional understanding the problem/ project / development of project /case study	<b>4-6 marks</b>
	Inadequate and/or irrelevant evidence, virtually no evidence of appropriate selection, no discussion of selection criteria, unsystematic or omitted referencing	<b>0-4 marks</b>
<b>Research Methodology (5 Marks)</b>	Provides excellent theoretical understanding rigorously argued approach, exceptional understanding evident	<b>4-5 marks</b>
	Clear and relevant theoretical basis, appropriate approach, useful and appropriate information. An awareness of strengths and weaknesses of approach.	<b>3-4 marks</b>
	Some evidence of a theoretical basis, reasonably explained.	<b>2-3 marks</b>
	Irrelevant, very limited explanation of approach to the study	<b>0-2 marks</b>
<b>Analysis of Primary and/or Secondary Data (8 Marks)</b>	Outstanding analytical techniques and approaches, evidence of creation of new approaches (if appropriate), thorough and rigorous analysis, exceptionally well justified	<b>8- 6 marks</b>
	Standard approach to collection, clear validity and reliability, critical analysis using appropriate techniques and appropriate criteria	<b>6-4 marks</b>
	Standard approach to collection, limited validity, limited and basic, but acceptable evaluation or techniq	<b>4-2 marks</b>
	Extremely limited collection of data, poorly identified data, no criteria for evaluation, no analysis	<b>0-2 marks</b>

<b>Discussion &amp; Findings (7 Marks)</b>	Sophisticated and critical discussion of the issues involved, outstanding reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the research, offers fresh/new insights on the problem or development	<b>7 - 5 marks</b>
	Discussion shows a very limited awareness of theory and attempt to link this to the findings. There is a very limited discussion of the implications, and limitations of the research or development	<b>5 - 3 marks</b>
	Findings are not effective, discussion shows no learning from the evidence presented	<b>0-3 marks</b>
<b>Presentation, Structure &amp; Language (5 marks)</b>	Outstanding logical flow, excellent use of language, appealing and effective use of graphics, charts and tables, appropriate and consistent referencing, very skilfully developed structure, outstanding logical flow, most effective use of conventions appropriate for purpose	<b>4-5 marks</b>
	Clear and effective use of graphics and charts, no spelling or grammatical errors, appropriate and consistent referencing, logical, clear and coherent structure	<b>3-4 marks</b>
	Adequate use of graphics and charts, good command of spelling and grammar, some typos, some omissions or inconsistencies in reference list, most sections have a logical flow and structure	<b>2-3 marks</b>
	Mostly inarticulate and incomprehensible, very hard to understand and follow, confused and unstructured	<b>0-2 marks</b>
<b>Conclusion (10 marks)</b>	Exceptional conclusions that relate strongly to the topic of the dissertation with excellent justification in the evidence. Conclusions add new insight to the topic of the dissertation and identify clear and practical recommendations / opportunities for further development	<b>8-10 marks</b>
	Exceptional conclusions that relate strongly to the topic of the dissertation with excellent justification in the evidence. Conclusions add new insight to the topic of the dissertation and identify clear and practical recommendations / opportunities for further development	<b>6-8 marks</b>
	Conclusions have limited justification in the evidence, there is limited relationship to existing theory and the topic of the dissertation, very limited recommendations / opportunities for further development	<b>4-6 marks</b>
	Conclusions poorly justified by evidence, they have a poor relationship to the topic of the dissertation, their development is of poor quality, recommendations / opportunities for further development are not of practical use	<b>0-4 marks</b>

<b>Research Publications (25 marks)</b>	Publications in UGC care listed Group I (Journals that have qualified through UGC-CARE protocols)	<b>20-25 marks</b>
	Publications in UGC care listed Group 2 (Journals that are indexed in globally recognized databases)	<b>15-20 marks</b>
	Publications in Peer Reviewed journals	<b>5-15 marks</b>
	No publication	<b>0-5 marks</b>
<b>Viva-voce (25 Marks)</b>	Give complete and logical reply to the questions asked by external examiner & crisp to-the-point answers & attire is appropriate.	<b>20-25 marks</b>
	Give logical reply to the questions asked by external examiner with few errors & crisp to-the-point answers & attire is appropriate.	<b>15-20 marks</b>
	Give incomplete and illogical reply to the questions asked by external examiner & average attire.	<b>10-15 marks</b>
	Give very few and vague answers to the questions asked by external examiner & not proper attire.	<b>0-10 marks</b>