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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| **Area** | **A****10.0 – 7.0** | **B****6.9 – 5.0** | **C****4.9 – 3.5** | **F****3.4 - 0** | **Score** |
| **Identification of Main Issue / Problem** | * Clearly identifies the main issue/problem.
* Provides a clear position statement.
* Introduces all of the key ideas to be discussed.
* Ends with a clear identification of the main questions raised in the case study.
 | * Clearly identifies the main issue/problem.
* Provides a relatively clear position statement.
* Introduces most of the key ideas to be discussed.
* Ends with some of the main questions raised by the case study.
 | * Identifies the main/problem, but the statements are not clear.
* Provides a vague position statement.
* Introduces a few ideas to be discussed.
* Ends with a few questions raised, but they are not all relevant. Many main questions not identified.
 | * Unable to identify the main issue/problem.
* Doesn’t identify own position.
* Identifies some irrelevant ideas.
* Unable to identify any main questions or presents irrelevant questions.
 |  |
| **Quality of Analysis & Interpretation**  | * Provides a comprehensive, insightful analysis, synthesis and interpretation of the issue.
* Provides a clear summary of the case facts.
* Defines terms as needed using appropriate academic sources.
* Provides logical and highly convincing argumentation.
* Ties extensive discussion to the facts of the case.
* Draws clear conclusions and identifies implications.
 | * Provides very good analysis, synthesis and interpretation of the issue.
* Provides a relatively clear summary of the case facts.
* Defines most terms as needed using appropriate academic sources.
* Provides logical and convincing argumentation.
* Ties discussion to the facts of the case.
* Draws most conclusions and identifies most implications.
 | * Provides partial analysis and interpretation. Issue needs further exploration.
* Provides an incomplete summary of the case facts.
* Defines a few terms as needed, relying on dictionary definitions.
* Provides weak, illogical argumentation.
* Shows weak discussion that doesn’t tie in well with the case.
* Draws a few conclusions and identifies some implications.
 | * Analysis and interpretation is limited.
* Provides a limited summary of the case facts.

Doesn’t define any terms.* Provides limited, often irrelevant argumentation.
* Discussion is inadequate and limited.
* Conclusions and implications of the issue are missing.
 |  |
| **Area** | **A****10.0 – 7.0** | **B****6.9 – 5.0** | **C****4.9 – 3.5** | **F****3.4 - 0** | **Score** |
| **Quality of Solution / Strategies** | * Identifies innovative and comprehensive solution/strategies, demonstrating outstanding problem solving skills.
* Provides extensive data/research/literature references/examples to support solution/strategies.
 | * Identifies original and well developed solution/strategies, demonstrating effective problem solving skills.
* Provides sufficient data/ research/literature references/examples to support solution/strategies.
 | * Provides some solution/strategies, showing limited problem solving skills.
* Provides limited use of data/research/literature references/examples to support solution/strategies.
 | * Unable to provide solution/strategies. Lacks problem solving skills.
* No data/ research/literature/examples provided.
 |  |
| **Selection / Accuracy of Solution** | * Selects an appropriate method and solution.
* Clearly identifies concepts or principles involved.
* Produces correct outputs.
* Shows excellent knowledge and accuracy in implementation of solution.
 | * Selects an appropriate method and solution.
* Most of the time clearly identifies concepts or principles involved.
* Mostly produces correct outputs.
* Shows good knowledge with some minor errors in implementing the solution.
 | * Selects a method and solution, but it is mostly incorrect.
* Vaguely identifies some of the concepts or principles involved.
* Produces a few correct outputs.
* Solution contains frequent errors.
 | * Unable to select an appropriate method and solution.
* Unable to identify concepts or principles involved.
* Produces incorrect outputs.
* Solution attempt is inaccurate.
 |  |
| **Problem Solving**  | * Demonstrates exceptional analysis and problem solving abilities.
* Analysis reflects an original approach to the issue.
* Understands stakeholder needs and situation.
 | * Demonstrates very good analysis and problem solving abilities.
* Analysis reflects a methodical approach to the issue.
* Mostly understands stakeholder needs and situation.
 | * Demonstrates some analysis and problem solving abilities. An attempt is made at a solution.
* Shows little understanding of stakeholder needs and situation.
 | * Demonstrates little analysis and problem solving. No attempt made at a solution.
* Doesn’t understand stakeholder needs and situation.
 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **A****10.0 – 7.0** | **B****6.9 – 5.0** | **C****4.9 – 3.5** | **F****3.4 - 0** | **Score** |
| **Use of Supporting Information** | * Uses relevant, timely, extensive and varied sources to convince.
* Supports main ideas with a range of varied, timely and relevant references.
* Uses supporting details selectively, and integrates into the text with sophistication.
* Excellence balance between quoting and paraphrasing.
* Uses primary and secondary sources as appropriate.
 | * Uses relevant, timely and varied sources to convince.
* Supports main ideas with varied, timely and relevant references
* Uses supporting details selectively, and appropriately integrates into the text.
* Uses primary and secondary sources as appropriate.
* Very good balance between quoting and paraphrasing.
 | * Uses limited resources that are not well selected to support the response.
* Supports main ideas with references on an occasional basis.
* Uses secondary resources only.
* Often presents unsupported opinion or ideas.
* Inadequate balance between quoting and paraphrasing.
 | * Lacks fundamental resources to write an effective response.
* Inadequate reference support.
 |  |
| **Critical Review of Data / Research / Literature** | * Provides extensive evidence of in-depth critique of data/research/literature.
* Includes analysis of current research in the field.
* Links information to class content/text.
 | * Provides well selected evidence of careful critique of data/research/literature.
* Includes analysis of current research in the field.
* Links some information to class content/text.
 | * Provides some evidence of limited analysis of data/research/literature.
* Little/no reference to current research.
* Links little information to class content/text.
 | * Provides little to no evidence of analysis of data/research/literature.
* No links made to class content/text.
 |  |
| **Theory, Logic, & Operative Rules** | * Understands and correctly selects and applies theory, logic and operative rules in decision making.
* Makes appropriate, insightful connections.
 | * In most cases understands and correctly selects, applies theory, logic and operative rules in decision making.
* Makes appropriate connections.
 | * In a few cases understands, selects, applies theory, logic and operative rules in decision making. Frequent errors in judgment.
 | * Unable to understand, select, apply theory, logic and operative rules in decision making.
 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **A****10.0 – 7.0** | **B****6.9 – 5.0** | **C****4.9 – 3.5** | **F****3.4 - 0** | **Score** |
| **Organization & Structure** | * Presents information is in a consistently logical structure.
* Shows sophisticated development of paragraph and sentence structure, with effective transitions.
* Shapes introduction skillfully to interest the audience.
* Carefully structures body of paper to support argumentation.
* Successfully and critically addresses counter arguments. Conclusion sums up main ideas with original, thoughtful closing commentary.
 | * Presents information in a logical structure.
* Shows well developed paragraph and sentence structure with effective transitions.
* Shapes introduction carefully to interest the audience.
* Carefully structures body of paper to support argumentation.
* Successfully addresses counter arguments.
* Conclusion sums up most of the main ideas with original, thoughtful closing commentary.
 | * Presents information in a random manner, lacking in logical structure.
* Paragraph and sentence structure is often faulty, using a few simple transitions.
* Introduction is vague and unfocused.
* Body of paper does not reveal good argumentation.
* Little to no reference to counter arguments.
* Conclusion is vague and demonstrates a few summary ideas.
 | * Presents poor overall organization, lacking logical structure.
* Paragraphs lack focus and appropriate structure; sentence structures are simplistic, lacking development and transition.
* Lacks introduction, Body of paper poorly developed.
* Lacks argumentation and reference to counter arguments.
* Conclusion is unfocused and often irrelevant.
 |  |
| **Writing Skills** | * Writes carefully crafted paragraphs, and transitions between sections, providing coherence and continuity to the response.
* Presents conclusion that sums up ideas and challenges thinking.
* Shows evidence of consistently original writer’s personal voice.
 | * Meets most case study written requirements.
* Writes carefully developed paragraphs with transitions between sections, providing a sense of continuity to the response.
* Presents conclusion that sums up most ideas and leaves reader thinking.
* Shows development of an original personal voice.
 | * Meets a few case study written requirements. Writes paragraphs that are often poorly developed with few transitions between sections.
* Presents conclusion that sums up a few ideas.
* Lacks continuity.
* Shows little development of a writer’s personal voice.
 | * Does not meet any case study written requirements.
* Writes paragraphs that are poorly written, with no transition between sections, creating confusion and lack of continuity in the response.
* Presents vague/no conclusion.
* Shows no development of a personal voice.
 |  |
| **Vocabulary** | * Understands and consistently and correctly uses relevant vocabulary.
 | * Understands and uses correctly uses relevant vocabulary.
 | * Understands and uses correctly some relevant vocabulary.
 | * Doesn’t use correct vocabulary.
 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **A****10.0 – 7.0** | **B****6.9 – 5.0** | **C****4.9 – 3.5** | **F****3.4 - 0** | **Score** |
| **Mechanics, Grammar, & Professional Format** | * Mainly error free.

Uses APA citation correctly.* Meets all requirements for an excellent academic response.
* Meets all case study written requirements.
 | * A few minor errors in usage, grammar, or mechanics.
* Generally uses APA citation correctly.
* Meets most requirements for a well written academic response.
* Meets most case study written requirements.
 | * Frequent errors in usage, grammar, and mechanics, beginning to interfere with the readability and meaning of the paper.
* Uses APA citation inconsistently and with errors.
* Meets a few requirements for an academic response.
* Meets a few case study written requirements.
 | * Numerous errors in usage, grammar, and mechanics, affecting the readability and meaning of the paper.
* Many errors in APA citation, demonstrating lack of citation knowledge.
* Does not meet requirements for an academic response.
* Does not adequately meet any case study written requirements.
 |  |
| **Oral Presentation Style** | * Demonstrates excellent delivery style, communicating professionally with passionate interest, excellent voice control, and consistent eye contact.
* Uses cue cards occasionally.
* Integrates multimedia appropriately as required to enhance presentation.
* Well prepared and rehearsed.
 | * Demonstrates very good delivery style, communicating professionally with good voice control and eye contact, conveying enthusiasm in the topic.
* Uses cue cards minimally as needed.
* Integrates multimedia appropriately as required to support presentation.
* Well prepared and rehearsed.
 | * Demonstrates inadequate delivery style, demonstrating inconsistency in voice control and eye contact, conveying limited interest in the topic.
* Often reads notes.
* Integrates multimedia on a limited basis.
* Appears inadequately prepared.
 | * Demonstrates poor delivery style, communicating with difficulty.
* Little to no eye contact.
* Relies on reading notes to the audience.
* Doesn’t integrate multimedia.
* Appears unprepared.
 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **A****10.0 – 7.0** | **B****6.9 – 5.0** | **C****4.9 – 3.5** | **F****3.4 - 0** | **Score** |
| **Oral Presentation Content** | * Presents information in depth on all areas of the case.
* Uses data/reference well.
* No inaccuracies in information.
 | * Presents well developed information on all areas of the case.
* Uses data/references well.
* No major inaccuracies in information.
 | * Presents information on some areas of the case.
* Uses some data/references.
* Some major and minor inaccuracies in information.
* Some important information overlooked.
 | * Presents limited information.
* Missing major and minor areas of the case.
* Uses few data/references.
* Many major and minor inaccuracies.
* Major information overlooked.
 |  |
| **Response to Questions** | * Demonstrates extensive knowledge in responding to questions.
* Provides answers that are focused and complete.
* Supports answers with theory/research.
* Uses many nonverbal listening behaviours to engage with the audience (eye contact, nodding, leaning forward).
 | * Demonstrates in-depth knowledge in responding to questions.
* Provides answers that are generally focused and complete.
* Supports answers with some theory/research.
* Uses some nonverbal listening behaviours to engage with the audience.
 | * Demonstrates surface knowledge in responding to questions.
* Provides answers that are mostly unclear and incomplete.
* Supports answers with limited reference to theory/research.
* Uses few nonverbal listening behaviours to engage with the audience.
 | * Unable to respond adequately to questions.
* No references to theory/research.
* Doesn’t use nonverbal listening behaviours to engage the audience.
 |  |
| **Teamwork** | * Shows evidence of all team members working together, doing extensive exploration to produce excellent final results.
* Uses time well, displaying synergy throughout the project.
* Consistently monitoring group effectiveness.
* Displays exceptional team communication.
 | * Shows evidence of all team members working together to explore most issues and produce well explored final results.
* Uses time well, displaying careful consideration of different ideas throughout the project.
* Most of the time monitoring group effectiveness.
* Displays very good team communication.
 | * Shows evidence of team members being inconsistent in exploring the issues, resulting in exploration at a very basic level. All members did not work together equally.
* Inconsistent in using time well.
* Occasionally monitoring group effectiveness.
* Displays inconsistent team communication.
 | * Shows evidence of team members doing limited exploration of the issue. Limited effort by most members of the group.
* No monitoring of group effectiveness.
* Displaying poor team communication.
 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **A****10.0 – 7.0** | **B****6.9 – 5.0** | **C****4.9 – 3.5** | **F****3.4 - 0** | **Score** |
| **Individual Contribution** | * Consistently and actively participates, providing useful and innovative ideas.
* Works hard to help team reach its goals.
 | * Most of the time participates actively, providing useful ideas.
* Works hard to help team reach goals.
 | * At times participates and provides ideas.
* At times helps team reach goals.
 | * Rarely participates or provides ideas.
* Provides minimal to no help for the team to reach its goals.
 |  |

**Plagiarism: A “0” grade will be given to a paper where significant sections of the paper were copied from other, unattributed sources.**

**Total Score out of 170:**

**Facilitator/Evaluator’s Comments:**