

FINAL EXAMINATION
Semester 1, Academic year 2024-2025

I. Examination information

Course Title:	Service Learning		
Course Code:	72HSER10053	Credits:	3
Class code:	241_72HSER10053_01,02,03,04,05,06,07		
Evaluation format:	Report	Duration:	14 days
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groupwork	
File name convention:	Student ID _Student's Full Name_.....		

II. The examination requirements must align with the CLOs.

(This part must be mapped with the information from the course syllabus)

CLO	CLO Description	Evaluation format	CLO weight in the assessment component (%)	Exam question No.	Maximum score	Data collection on student achievement of PLOs/PIs
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
CLO1	Explain clearly the concept of "service learning" from connotation to denotation, distinguished "service learning" and the other concepts such as "Community service" or "Volunteerism"	Essay	20%	Q1	2	PI1.1
CLO2	Identify the significant features of service learning and know how to design a service learning project	Essay	15%	Q2.1	1.5	PI2.2

CLO3	Cross-cultural communication, teamwork with groups of diverse backgrounds, interdisciplinary collaboration in designing and implementing service learning projects	Essay	30%	Q3.1	3	PI4.2
CLO4	Critical, creative, and inclusive thinking, be able to detect, analyze, and evaluate problems	Essay	10%	Q3.3	1	PI3.2
CLO5	Apply relevant methods and information technology in completing the assignments and projects	Essay	10%	Q3.2	1	PI6.2
CLO6	Reflect role and importance of service learning for the development of learners themselves, and the progress of society, thereby, actively participate in practicing social responsibility	Essay	15%	Q2.2	1.5	PI6.1

III. Examination content

In your assignment, please answer:

1. Service-Learning course (2 points)

1.1: Distinguish “Service learning” from other concepts “Educational activity”, “Volunteer work” and “community service”. Give and analyze examples (1 point)

1.2: In your opinion, why we need to take the course “Service Learning” in curriculum of the university? Give examples. (1 point)

2. Service-Learning for Your Major (3 points)

2.1 Research and Exploration (1.5 points)

- Search for an existing service-learning project relevant to your major (e.g., business, social sciences, education, engineering, etc.).
- Provide a brief description of the project, including its purpose, target community, and how it relates to your field of study.

2.2 Reflect on Learning (1.5 points)

- What Can You Learn from This Project?
- Reflect on the skills, knowledge, and personal growth that could be gained from participating in the service-learning project you identified.
- Consider both academic and non-academic aspects of learning (e.g., teamwork, empathy, community engagement, leadership).

3. Fieldwork (5 points)

3.1: Reflect what you have learnt and done from the fieldwork (pre, during and post)? (3 points)

3.2 How can you make your projects to meet the needs of the communities? (In order to get supports of the community) (1 point)

3.3. What attributes do you think the most necessary to help your fieldwork succeed? (1 point)

Total: 10 points.

2. Instructions on how to present the exam questions

- The assignment should have a cover page that includes the course code and name, assignment number and title, assessors' names and full name(s) of student(s) and ID.
- Include a content sheet with a list of all headings and page numbers (*table of content*).
- Plagiarism is **unacceptable**. Students must cite all sources, and input the information by paraphrasing, summarizing or using direct quotes. A Failed Grade is given when Plagiarism is identified in your work. There are **no exceptions**.
- Your evidence/findings must be cited using **APA Referencing Style**.
- It is highly recommended to include **photos, sketches, posters, and materials** from the project in your reflection.
- This assignment should be written in a concise, formal business style using font **Times New Roman, font size 12, and spacing 1.5**.

No word limitation. However, the reflection should consist of a minimum of ten A4 pages (excluding the title page, content sheet) or a word count of at least 4500 words.

3. Rubric and grading scale

Rubric: The final exam is a Group Project Report with individual evaluation. The following formula calculates the score:

Final exam score = Report scores * 0.7 + Peer evaluation * 0.3

Rubric for a group report

Rubric for question 1.1 (1 point):

Criteria	Excellent (1 point)	Good (0.75 points)	Needs Improvement (0.5 points)	Inadequate (0.25 points)
Explanation and Distinction	Clearly defines and distinguishes "Service Learning" from "Educational Activity," "Volunteer Work," and "Community Service," with relevant examples and thorough analysis of differences.	Provides mostly clear definitions and distinctions, but some may lack precision or depth.	Provides partial definitions and/or lacks clear distinction between the concepts, with limited examples.	Fails to define or distinguish the concepts clearly, or provides irrelevant or no examples.

Rubric for question 1.2 (1 point):

Criteria	Excellent (1 point)	Good (0.75 points)	Needs Improvement (0.5 points)	Inadequate (0.25 points)
Justification and Reflection	Provides a strong, well-reasoned justification for including Service Learning in the curriculum, supported by relevant examples and thoughtful reflection.	Provides a clear argument with some examples, though reasoning may lack depth or reflection.	Provides a weak argument, lacks substantial support, or provides vague or limited examples.	Fails to present a coherent argument or justification, with little to no support or reflection.

Rubric for question 2.1 (1.5 points):

Criteria	Excellent (0.5 points)	Good (0.38-0.49 points)	Needs Improvement (0.25-0.37 points)	Inadequate (0-0.24 points)
Identification of Relevant Project	Successfully identifies a highly relevant service-learning project	Identifies a relevant project, but the connection to the	Identifies a project, but its relevance to the	Fails to identify a relevant project or the project has

	related to the student's major.	major could be clearer.	major is vague or poorly explained.	little connection to the major.
Description of the Project	Provides a detailed, clear description of the project, including its purpose, target community, and relevance to the field.	Provides a clear description but lacks detail or thoroughness in one aspect (e.g., target community or purpose).	Provides a brief or incomplete description, lacking clarity or key details (e.g., incomplete explanation of purpose).	Fails to provide a coherent or accurate description of the project.
Connection to Major	Strong, insightful explanation of how the project relates directly to the field of study, demonstrating deep understanding.	Adequate explanation but lacks depth or misses some relevant points.	Provides a weak or unclear explanation of the connection between the project and the major.	Fails to explain how the project connects to the major or provides an incorrect connection.

Rubric for 2.2 (1.5 points)

Criteria	Excellent (0.5 points)	Good (0.38-0.49 points)	Needs Improvement (0.25-0.37 points)	Inadequate (0-0.24 points)
Reflection on Skills and Knowledge	Thoughtful reflection on the skills and knowledge that can be gained, with clear academic and non-academic insights.	Reflects on skills and knowledge, but some aspects are less developed or specific.	Provides a brief reflection but lacks depth or focuses only on one aspect of learning.	Fails to reflect on the skills or knowledge that could be gained or is superficial.
Personal Growth and Learning	Insightful reflection on how the project could contribute to personal growth (e.g., teamwork, empathy, leadership) with clear examples.	Reflects on personal growth but lacks depth or concrete examples in one or more areas.	Minimal reflection on personal growth, with vague or unclear connections.	No personal reflection on growth, or irrelevant/inaccurate reflection.
Connection to Academic Learning	Clearly connects academic and non-academic	Makes connections between learning	Provides minimal connection between learning	Fails to connect learning from the project to academic

	learning to the major, showing a deep understanding of how it complements academic study.	and the major, though one aspect may be underdeveloped.	and the academic field, with vague reasoning.	or personal development.
--	---	---	---	--------------------------

Rubric for 3.1 (3 points)

Criteria	Excellent (1 point)	Good (0.75-0.99 points)	Needs Improvement (0.5-0.74 points)	Inadequate (0-0.49 points)
Pre-fieldwork Reflection	Provides a thorough, detailed reflection on preparations made before the fieldwork, including goals, expectations, and potential challenges.	Reflects on preparations but may lack depth or fail to address some aspects such as goals or challenges clearly.	Brief reflection on pre-fieldwork, missing key details, or providing incomplete insights.	Little to no reflection on pre-fieldwork, with unclear or irrelevant insights.
During-fieldwork Reflection	Offers comprehensive analysis of actions and observations during the fieldwork, demonstrating a deep understanding of the experience.	Reflects on actions and observations during the fieldwork, but some insights may be missing or less developed.	Provides a reflection but lacks depth or clarity about specific actions and observations.	Little to no reflection on the fieldwork process, with weak or superficial insights.
Post-fieldwork Reflection	Thoughtfully reflects on the outcomes and lessons learned after the fieldwork, identifying successes, challenges, and personal growth.	Reflects on outcomes but may lack depth in discussing successes or challenges.	Brief or vague reflection on post-fieldwork, with minimal insights into growth or development.	Little to no meaningful reflection on post-fieldwork outcomes or personal growth.

Rubric for 3.2 (1 point)

Criteria	Excellent (1 point)	Good (0.75-0.99 points)	Needs Improvement (0.5-0.74 points)	Inadequate (0-0.49 points)
Addressing Community Needs	Provides a clear and well-reasoned plan for how the project will meet community needs, with examples of how it will gain community support.	Suggests a plan to meet community needs, but the reasoning or examples may lack depth.	Provides a plan but lacks clear details or fails to fully address how the project will meet community needs.	Fails to provide a plan or explanation of how the project will meet community needs or gain support.

Rubric for 3.3 (1 point)

Criteria	Excellent (1 point)	Good (0.75-0.99 points)	Needs Improvement (0.5-0.74 points)	Inadequate (0-0.49 points)
Attributes for Success	Identifies and explains key personal or professional attributes (e.g., leadership, communication, adaptability) necessary for successful fieldwork, with examples from experience or theory.	Identifies important attributes but may lack depth or detailed examples.	Lists attributes but provides weak or vague explanation of their importance to fieldwork success.	Fails to identify or explain any relevant attributes for fieldwork success.

Rubric for peer evaluation

Rating	Student's name
Group Participation Attends meetings regularly and on time.	
Time Management & Responsibility Accepts fair share of work and reliably completes it by the required time	

Adaptability Displays or tries to develop a wide range of skills in service of the project readily accepts changed approach or constructive criticism.	
Creativity/Originality Problem-solves when faced with impasses or challenges, originates new ideas, and initiates team decisions.	
Communication Skills Effective in discussions, good listener, capable presenter, proficient at diagramming, representing, and documenting work.	
General Team Skills Positive attitude, encourages and motivates team, supports team decisions, helps team reach consensus, helps resolve conflicts in the group.	
Technical Skills Ability to create and develop materials on own initiative provides technical solutions to problems.	
Comments, Examples, Explanations, etc.	
<i>Total score (convert to the 10-point scale)</i>	

Note for Scoring: award yourself and each team member a score using this scale.

- 3 – Better than most of the group in this respect
- 2 – About average for the group in this respect
- 1 – Not as good as most of the group in this respect
- 0 – No help at all to the group in this respect

Approval



Đoàn Duy Chí Lâm

Ho Chi Minh City, 07 / 10 /2024.

Lecturer



Nguyễn Văn Thông, Ph.D.