

Rubric for Capstone

Criteria	Level of Achievement			
	Excellent (4 pts)	Good (3 pts)	Needs Improvement (2 pts)	Unacceptable (1 pt)
Contribution (15%)	The deliverable offered new information or approach to the topic under discussion.	The deliverable offered significant amount of new information or approach to the topic under discussion.	The deliverable offered some new information or approach to the topic under discussion.	The deliverable offered no new information or approach to the topic under discussion.
Subject Knowledge (15%)	The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the seminar content by integrating major and minor concepts into the paper. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking about the topic.	The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of most of the seminar content by integrating major and minor concepts into the paper. The deliverable also demonstrated some evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking about the topic.	The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the seminar content by integrating major concepts into the paper. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of limited research effort and/or initial of thinking about the topic.	The deliverable did not demonstrate knowledge of the seminar content, evidence of the research effort or depth of thinking about the topic.
Analysis (10%)	A thorough analysis is presented and explained.	An analysis is presented and explained, but there are 1-2 things wrong with the analysis—e.g., at least one major item is missing, or an item is inappropriately categorized.	An analysis is presented and explained, but there are 3-4 things wrong with the analysis or the explanation is very unclear.	The analysis is either very poorly done (>5 things wrong with it) or missing, and/or the explanation is missing.
Identification of Research Question or Problem (15%)	Clearly identifies problems/issues, based on the analysis. The problems/issues are prioritized, differentiating those that are important from those that are routine. Relationships among the problems are identified,	Problem and issue identification is clear, based on the analysis, and prioritizations have been made. Most, but not all, judgments about priorities are appropriate. Most of the relationships and the	Problem and issue identification is unclear in some aspects and is not wholly based on the analysis. Prioritization is confused. Relationships and the key underlying problem/issue are either misidentified or missing.	The problem identification is missing or not based on the analysis at all. In addition, there is no attention given to relationships among and prioritization of

	with the underlying, primary or key problem/issue clearly designated.	key underlying problem/issue are identified.		problems. Shows lack of judgment.
Identification and Analysis of Alternative Perspectives (10%)	Clearly identifies several alternative perspectives that can be used to address the problems/issues. The list of alternatives is complete and linkage to the analysis and problems/issues is clear, providing clear reasoning for inclusion as an alternative. Analysis of alternative perspectives is detailed. Any necessary assumptions are stated and justified. The likely benefits/disadvantages of each perspective are clearly identified and supported by the analysis.	Identifies alternative perspectives that can be taken to address problems/issues. Most, but not all perspectives are linked to the analysis and problems/issues. Analysis of alternatives is detailed, but some statements are unsupported by analysis/calculations. Assumptions are stated, but some are not justified. Most, but not all, benefits/disadvantages are clearly identified and supported by the analysis.	The list of alternative perspectives is incomplete or unclear in some aspects, and includes alternatives that are not based on the analysis or are not reasonably linked to the problems and issues. Some analysis is included, but it is not very detailed. Many statements are not supported by analysis/calculations. Most of the stated assumptions are not justified. Several benefits/disadvantages are missing and/or not clearly identified or unsupported by the analysis.	Either the list of alternative perspectives is missing or the list is very incomplete or there is no linkage of the alternatives to the analysis or to the problems/issues. Shows lack of thorough consideration. Analysis is trivial or missing, lacking any depth. No assumptions are stated (& are needed). Likely benefits/disadvantages are not provided at all or are unsupported by the analysis.

Conclusion and Recommendations (15%)	A clear conclusion is given, logically derived from the analysis, or provides recommendations for the identified problems/issues. Assumptions, caveats, ongoing considerations concerning recommendation are provided.	A conclusion is given, which is mostly, but not completely, logically derived from analysis. There may be a better recommendation than the one derived. Most, but not all, assumptions, caveats, and ongoing considerations are provided.	A conclusion is provided, but logical derivation from analysis is unclear, and there is clearly a better recommendation. The recommendation is based on more than one perspective. No identification of assumptions, caveats, or considerations that might affect the recommendation is provided.	A conclusion is provided, but it is not derived from the analysis at all; or the recommendation is clearly not viable; or the recommendation does not address the problems/issues.
Supporting	All relevant information was	Most of the relevant	Some information was	Insufficient

Material (10%)	obtained and information sources were valid. Analysis was well supported by the information.	information was obtained and most of the information sources were valid. Analysis was mostly well supported by the information.	obtained and most sources were valid. Analysis considerations were somewhat supported by the information.	information was obtained and/or sources lack validity. Analysis considerations were not supported by the information collected.
Organization (10%, includes organization, grammar, appendices)	Written work is well organized and easy to understand. There is a brief introduction. Sections are marked with appropriate headings. There are page numbers.	The organization is generally good. There is a brief introduction and section headings; there are page numbers. But some sections seem out of place or mislabeled, diminishing the ease with which the paper reads and is understood.	The organization is unclear; headings are missing. The introduction is not succinct. Page numbers may be missing.	The paper is disorganized to the extent that it prevents understanding of content. There are no headings. There is no introduction. There are no page numbers.
Grammar, Spelling, and Formatting	The work has been thoroughly spell-checked and proofread. There are none to almost none grammatical or spelling errors. There are no formatting errors.	There are a few spelling and grammatical errors. There are one to three formatting errors.	There is more than one spelling or grammatical error per page. There is at least one formatting error per page.	There are frequent misspelled words, serious grammatical errors, and formatting errors, indicating that time was not taken to spell-check and proofread the report.
Use of Appendices	Information is appropriately placed in either the main text or an appendix. Appendices are documented and referenced in the text.	Information is appropriately placed in either the main text or an appendix. Documentation and referencing in text are somewhat incomplete.	There is some misplacement of information in the text vs. the appendix. Appendices are poorly documented and referenced in the text.	Considerable amount of material is misplaced. Appendices are not documented or referenced in text.

Relations between grades and level of achievement

S: 3.46 or above
A: 2.8 to 3.45 points
B: 2.13 to 2.8 points
C: 1.6 to 2.12 points
D: 1.2 to 1.59 points
E: 0.8 to 1.19 points

The sources used for the rubric stated above:

<https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/assessment/examples/courselevel-bycollege/hss/tools/jeria.pdf>
<http://www.bus.iastate.edu/kpalan/mkt443/Rubric%20for%20Case%20Analysis.doc>.