DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY
ASSESSMENT SHEET: JOB SHADOW REPORT or INTERVIEW

STUDENT:			US NR:		
Exposure to job shadowing period?			**Job Shadowing**		
GENERAL CONTENT OVERVIEW					

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	NA / did not evaluate
❖ Company background & description of task					
❖ Recruitment					
❖ Selection					
❖ Training and development					
❖ Performance management					
❖ Remuneration Management					
❖ HR Research					
❖ Employment Relations					
❖ Personnel maintenance					

	Unsatisfactory	Requires More Work	Satisfactory	Excellent
Introduction	No link between introduction and main text, or no introduction whatsoever. Limited information about the experience / interview / organization.	Introduction is included but it does not give adequate information about the experience / interview / organization.	Good introduction. States background of the job shadowing experience / interview. Gives adequate background of the organization.	Excellent introduction. Clear statement of the job shadowing experience or interview. Provided comprehensive background of the organization.
Contents	Superficial attempt at the assignment. Assignment incorrectly interpreted or completely misunderstood. No critical assessment Totally inappropriate argument.	Displays limited understanding of the assignment. Inappropriate level of interpreting the information Limited critical assessment of the information gathered Unconvincing presentation of own argument.	Shows good understanding and addresses the assignment appropriately. Adequate level of interpreting the information Satisfactory critical assessment of the information gathered Satisfactory presentation of own argument .	Shows very good understanding and command of the assignment. Correct level of interpreting the information Excellent critical assessment of the information gathered Excellent presentation of own argument.
Conclusion	Abrupt ending. Poor summary. Arguments are not integrated.	Attempt made to deduce some conclusions but doesn't entirely integrate the arguments and/or introduces new arguments.	Good conclusions and/or recommendations overall.	Excellent conclusions and/or recommendations. Facts / arguments integrated in a logical manner.
Structure and Logicial flow	Incomplete arguments or unmotivated statements. Information is poorly integrated and without a clear argument. No evidence of coherent paragraphing. No link between paragraphs.	Arguments in some instances incomplete or unmotivated. Integration sometimes lacking. Paragraphing not always used efficiently. Paragraph links, marks and signals sometimes ineffective.	Argument is generally logically developed, formulated and supported. Paragraphing is in general used correctly. Paragraphs are mostly effectively linked, marked and signaled	Paragraphing used effectively to ensure coherency (each paragraph has a primary statement and supporting statements). Paragraphs are effectively linked, marked and signaled Logical development and formulation of arguments.
Language and Style	Emotional, biased or journalistic use of language. Formulation throughout is vague, not in own words, or simply a direct translation of the text. No attempt to accurately translate from sources where necessary. Piece not proofread / serious language errors.	Unclear, poor language tends to obscure the argument, although overall understandable. Formulation sometimes vague.	Clear enough to understand the contents of the piece. Good language usage in general. Few grammar/spelling mistakes.	Scientific, clear and concise. Impeccable language usage. No grammar/spelling mistakes.
General Appearance and technical care	More than a page (30%) too long/short (12pt, 1.5 spacing, justified). Presentation messy. Inappropriate method of referencing or no referencing	A page (20%) too long/short (12pt, 1.5 spacing, justified). Presentation requires attention. Inappropriate method of referencing	Half a page too long/short (10%) (12pt, 1.5 spacing, justified). Neat presentation. Referencing present	8-10 pages (12pt, 1.5 spacing, justified). Very neat presentation. Appropriate method of referencing

Other comments:

Lecturer: _____   **Date:** _____