

Anti-scam Lesson Plan Competition 2026

Assessment Rubric

Criteria	Weighting	Detailed Rubric	Score (1-10)
Creativity of the Lesson Design	30%	• Outstanding (9-10): The lesson design presents a highly innovative approach that captivates students' interest and utilizes unique methods or tools. It includes unexpected elements that engage students in a memorable way. • Good (7-8): The lesson design is creative and includes interesting activities or approaches that enhance student engagement. It shows a clear effort to think outside the box while remaining relevant to the topic. • Average (5-6): The lesson design includes some creative elements, but they are somewhat predictable or lack depth. It engages students but does not significantly stand out. • Marginal (3-4): The lesson design demonstrates minimal creativity. It relies heavily on traditional methods and does not effectively capture students' interest. • Fail (1-2): The lesson design is unoriginal and lacks any creative elements. It fails to engage students and does not utilize any innovative approaches.	
Effectiveness of the Lesson Design in Promoting Anti-Scam	40%	• Outstanding (9-10): The lesson design effectively educates students about scams in a comprehensive manner. It provides clear, actionable strategies for recognizing and avoiding scams, resulting in significant potential impact on students' awareness. • Good (7-8): The lesson design effectively covers key aspects of scams and includes practical strategies for students. It successfully raises awareness, although some areas could be expanded for greater impact. • Average (5-6): The lesson design addresses scams but lacks depth in teaching prevention strategies. It raises awareness but may not provide sufficient tools for students to effectively recognize and respond to scams. • Marginal (3-4): The lesson design shows limited effectiveness in promoting anti-scam awareness. It may cover some information but lacks clear guidance or engagement strategies that resonate with students. • Fail (1-2): The lesson design fails to effectively address the issue of scams. It lacks relevant content or strategies and does not engage students in a meaningful way regarding anti-scam education.	

Integration of Cross-Disciplinary Expertise in Lesson Design	20%	• Outstanding (9–10): The lesson design demonstrates excellent integration of expertise from multiple relevant disciplines. Diverse perspectives are meaningfully incorporated to create a comprehensive, innovative, and well-balanced anti-scam learning experience. • Good (7–8): The lesson design incorporates expertise from more than one relevant discipline. Cross-disciplinary perspectives contribute effectively to the content, learning activities, or teaching approaches. • Average (5–6): The lesson design shows some evidence of cross-disciplinary input, but the integration is limited or not consistently reflected across the lesson content and activities. • Marginal (3–4): The lesson design includes limited evidence of cross-disciplinary expertise. Contributions from different disciplines are unclear, superficial, or weakly connected to the anti-scam learning objectives. • Fail (1–2): The lesson design shows no meaningful integration of cross-disciplinary expertise. It relies on a single perspective and does not demonstrate how diverse knowledge or skills support anti-scam education.	
Presentation	10%	• Outstanding (9-10): The presentation is highly engaging, well-organized, and visually appealing. The presenter communicates ideas clearly, confidently, and enthusiastically, effectively capturing the audience’s attention. • Good (7-8): The presentation is clear and well-structured, with good visual aids. The presenter communicates ideas effectively but may lack a bit of energy or engagement. • Average (5-6): The presentation is adequately organized but may lack clarity or engagement. Visual aids are present but not particularly compelling or well-integrated. • Marginal (3-4): The presentation is poorly organized and lacks clarity. The presenter struggles to communicate ideas effectively, and visual aids may be minimal or ineffective. • Fail (1-2): The presentation is disorganized and unclear. The presenter fails to engage the audience, and there are little to no visual aids to support the content.	