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| **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:**