

	Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Overall (20%)	Understanding Developed (10%)	The scenario demonstrates a deep and nuanced understanding of the selected domain(s) of life and competency(ies) under the Resilience and Integrity Project (RISE) Framework with relevant concepts.	The scenario demonstrates good understanding of the selected domain(s) of life and competency(ies) under the Resilience and Integrity Project (RISE) Framework with relevant concepts.	The scenario demonstrates some understanding of the selected domain(s) of life and competency(ies) under the Resilience and Integrity Project (RISE) Framework with relevant concepts.	The scenario demonstrates limited understanding of the selected domain(s) of life and competency(ies) under the Resilience and Integrity Project (RISE) Framework with wrong concepts.
	Topic relevancy (10%)	The scenario topic is highly relevant, demonstrating a thorough and very clear connection to either a specific discipline OR a real-world issue applicable to a broad audience.	The scenario topic is relevant and demonstrates a clear connection to either a specific discipline OR a real-world issue applicable to a broad audience.	The scenario topic has some relevance, but the connection to either a specific discipline OR a general real-world issue is weak and unclear.	The scenario topic is not relevant, has made no connection with either a specific discipline OR a general real-world issue.
Content (60%)	Organisation (10%)	The scenario script is exceptionally well structured.	The scenario script is well structured.	The scenario script has some structural issues.	The scenario script is poorly structured.
		The two-level branching structure is very clear and coherent, with each Level 1 choice leading to a distinct and logical Level 2 path.	The connection between Level 1 choices and their corresponding Level 2 paths is clear.	The connection between Level 1 choices and their corresponding Level 2 paths is weak.	The connection between Level 1 choices and their corresponding Level 2 paths is very weak or broken.
	Design of choices (20%)	The scenario perfectly implements a two-level branching structure with 3 or more meaningful and distinct options at each decision point.	The scenario correctly implements a two-level branching structure with 3 or more options at each decision point.	The scenario implements a two-level branching structure with fewer than 3 options at each decision point.	The scenario does not follow the required two-level branching structure, and/or the choices are missing.
		All choices/options successfully prompt audience's critical/reflective thinking.	All choices/options are able to prompt audience's critical/reflective thinking.	The choices are not always able to prompt audience's critical or reflective thinking.	The choices cannot prompt audience's critical or reflective thinking.
	Explanation (20%)	All selected choices are provided with clear alignment to the relevant competence codes.	All selected choices are provided with alignment to the relevant competence codes.	The selected choices do not have a clear alignment to the relevant competence codes.	The selected choices are not provided with clear alignment to the relevant competence codes.
		"Outcomes" subsequent to Level 2 choices provide inspiring and well-reasoned insights that reinforce positive behaviours and/or prompt positive changes.	"Outcomes" subsequent to Level 2 choices provide good insights that reinforce positive behaviours and/or prompt some positive changes.	Some but not all "Outcomes" subsequent to Level 2 choices attempt to provide insights that reinforce positive behaviours and/or prompt some positive changes.	No or only a handful of "Outcomes" subsequent to Level 2 choices attempt to provide insights that reinforce positive behaviours and/or prompt some positive changes.
	Language (10%)	Language used in the scenario is error-free.	Language used in the scenario contains minimal errors but is generally effective in communication.	Language used in the scenario contains errors, affecting the effectiveness of communication.	Language used in the scenario contains major errors, hampering the effectiveness of communication.
		The expressions used are captivating, concise, and perfectly suited to the audience.	The expressions used are clear, informative, and easy to understand.	The expressions used cause ambiguity sometimes and/or are less appropriate for the audience.	The expressions used are often unclear and unengaging.
Graphic Design (20%)	Graphic Design (20%)	The video is immersive, augmenting the narrative and deepening audience engagement.	The video effectively enhances the narrative and maintains audience engagement.	The video supplements the narrative but has a limited effect on audience engagement.	The video is distracting or disconnected from the narrative, hindering engagement.
		Production quality is high and ready for future adaptation.	Production quality is good and has potential for future adaptation.	Production quality is inconsistent, requiring substantial changes for adaptation.	Production quality is overall poor not suitable for adaptation.