

Job Crafting – Assessment

Evaluation Statement: Self-assessment (Blog)

Purpose. The blog documents individual learning, connecting course concepts to personal practice with evidence from activities and/or the e-simulation.

Deliverable. One post (≈400–700 words) with: (a) accurate use of key concepts, (b) reflective analysis, (c) concrete evidence (e.g., artifacts, decisions, feedback), and (d) a brief action plan.

Assessment roles & weighting.

- **Teacher (rubric): 70%** – applies the Self-assessment (Blog) rubric to judge conceptual accuracy, depth of reflection, evidence, application, organization, and referencing.
- **Peers (pairs) using the same rubric: 30%** – two classmates independently score and comment; their mean forms the peer component.

Grading instrument. Official Self-assessment (Blog) rubric (3 levels: Excellent / Pass / Not Pass; weighted dimensions).

Moderation & quality control. The teacher reviews all peer scores, may adjust for bias/outliers, and ensures comments are constructive and aligned to criteria.

Submission & integrity. Post to the LMS with links; cite sources where relevant. Original work only; AI or external assistance must be declared per course policy.

Pass threshold. Aggregated weighted score $\geq 60\%$.

Evaluation Statement: Team Assessment — Podcast or Video Role-Playing a Scenario (Pairs)

Purpose. In pairs, students stage a realistic scenario to demonstrate responsible-leadership behaviors and well-being/job-crafting levers, making and justifying decisions.

Deliverable.

- **Artifact:** 4–7 min video role-play or 6–10 min podcast.
- **Cover note:** 150–200 words describing roles, key decisions, and links to course concepts.

Assessment roles & weighting.

- **Teacher (rubric): 60%** – evaluates alignment to learning outcomes, decision quality, communication/professional delivery, ethics/well-being/inclusion, evidence/justification, technical compliance.
- **Peers (pairs) using the same rubric: 30%** – two other pairs score and comment; mean forms the peer component.
- **Individual contribution check: 10%** – brief self/partner contribution statement; the teacher may redistribute this portion within the pair when contributions are uneven.

Grading instrument. Team Video Role-Play rubric (3 levels: Excellent / Pass / Not Pass; weighted dimensions).

Moderation & quality control. The teacher audits peer scores and comments, moderates anomalies, and ensures feedback quality; serious discrepancies trigger a teacher-only regrade.

Submission & integrity. Upload media file/link and cover note to the LMS; include brief source credits/consents as applicable. Academic integrity and respectful conduct are mandatory.

Pass threshold. Aggregated weighted score $\geq 60\%$.

Appendix 1. Self-assessment (blog) Rubrics

Scoring guidance (suggested): Excellent = 3; Pass = 2; Not Pass = 0 (apply weights by dimension).

Minimum standard to pass: Weighted score $\geq 60\%$.

Dimension (Weight)	Excellent	Pass	Not Pass
Alignment with learning outcomes & use of concepts (20%)	Accurately applies key course concepts; integrates terminology and models to interpret own learning.	Mostly accurate use of concepts; limited integration or superficial connections.	Misapplies or omits key concepts; connections to outcomes are unclear.
Depth of reflection & critical insight (25%)	Moves beyond description to analyze successes, challenges, and assumptions; demonstrates self-awareness and growth.	Describes what happened with some reasoning; limited analysis of causes or alternatives.	Primarily descriptive; little/no reflection or insight.
Evidence & examples (15%)	Supports claims with specific evidence (e.g., task outputs, simulation decisions, peer/instructor feedback).	Includes at least one concrete example; evidence is present but limited.	Vague generalities; no verifiable examples or evidence.
Application & action plan (20%)	Derives clear implications for future practice and presents a concise SMART action plan.	Mentions implications and next steps, but actions are broad or not time-bound.	No meaningful application or action plan.
Organization, clarity & mechanics (10%)	Well-structured (intro–body–conclusion); concise ($\approx 400\text{--}700$ words); clear style with minimal errors.	Generally clear; minor issues in structure, length, or language that do not impede understanding.	Disorganized, unclear, or far outside length expectations; frequent errors impede reading.
Referencing & academic integrity (10%)	Appropriately cites 1–2 relevant sources (course materials/readings); accurate paraphrasing; original work.	Basic citation of at least one source; minor formatting issues.	Missing citations for borrowed ideas; plagiarism or integrity concerns.

Appendix 2. Podcast or video role-playing

Scoring guidance (suggested): Excellent = 3; Pass = 2; Not Pass = 0 (apply the listed weights).

Minimum standard to pass: Weighted score $\geq 60\%$. **Submission checklist (recommended):** 4–7 min video, pair roles stated on title card, brief source credits, and a 1–2 min debrief (or 150–200-word note).

Dimension (Weight)	Excellent	Pass	Not Pass
Alignment with learning outcomes & conceptual accuracy (20%)	Accurately applies key course frameworks (e.g., responsible leadership behaviors, well-being/job-crafting levers) to the scenario; concepts drive choices.	Uses relevant concepts with minor inaccuracies or partial alignment to outcomes.	Misapplies/omits key concepts; weak or no alignment to outcomes.
Scenario fidelity & decision quality (15%)	Scenario is realistic and coherent; decisions are timely, well-reasoned, and show anticipation of stakeholder impacts and risks.	Mostly realistic; decisions are sensible but lack depth or consideration of trade-offs.	Implausible scenario; arbitrary or unjustified decisions.
Team collaboration & role clarity (pairs) (15%)	Clear, complementary roles; equitable contribution evidenced in planning and on-screen performance; smooth turn-taking.	Roles are defined but uneven contributions or occasional coordination issues.	Roles unclear; one member dominates or missing contribution.
Communication & professional delivery (15%)	Persuasive, audience-appropriate delivery; clear structure; effective nonverbal cues; strong pacing and emphasis.	Generally clear; occasional fillers, pacing issues, or uneven clarity.	Hard to follow; frequent hesitations; poor structure impedes understanding.
Ethics, well-being & inclusion integration (10%)	Explicitly addresses ethical considerations, psychological safety, and inclusion; actions model responsible leadership.	Mentions ethics/well-being/inclusion but superficially.	Ignores or mishandles ethical and well-being aspects.
Evidence & justification (10%)	Decisions are justified with concrete evidence (e.g., course readings, prior exercises, simulation logs); sources briefly cited.	Some evidence/examples provided, but limited or generic.	Claims lack evidence; no linkage to course materials.

Dimension (Weight)	Excellent	Pass	Not Pass
Reflection & transfer (post-video debrief ~1–2 min or short note) (10%)	Critically reflects on what worked/failed and outlines specific improvements and transfer to future practice.	Basic reflection with general lessons; limited transfer planning.	Minimal or descriptive only; no actionable takeaways.
Technical quality & compliance (5%)	Meets all specs (length 4–7 min; format; credits/consents); audio and visuals are clear; editing supports message.	Minor deviations from specs or occasional audio/visual issues.	Major technical problems or non-compliance with required specs.

Disclaimer: This document was co-funded by the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union. Co-funded by the European Union or of other members of the RESPRO consortium.