IACBE Region 1 New England Case Rubric October 25, 2024

Novice 1	Competent 2	Accomplished 3	Score
Does not recognize the problems or issues of the case or identifies problems and issues that are not based on facts of the case; displays little understanding of the issues, key problems, and the company's present situation and strategic challenges.	With a few exceptions, identifies and outlines the principal problems and issues in the case; demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the company's issues, current situation, and strategic challenges.	Presents accurate and detailed descriptions of the problems and issues central to the case; provides a well-focused diagnosis of strategic issues and key problems that demonstrates an excellent grasp of the company's present situation and strategic challenges.	
Does not identify or explain the perspectives of any stakeholders involved in the case, or explanation is flawed in many respects; fails to recognize any differences between the interests of the various stakeholders.	With a few minor exceptions, adequately identifies and summarizes the perspectives of the principal stakeholders involved in the case; outlines some conflicts of interest between company stakeholders.	Clearly and accurately describes the unique perspectives of multiple key stakeholders in the case; demonstrates insightful analysis of strategic tensions or conflicts of interest between the stakeholders.	
Makes little or no connection between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research, or the connections identified are weak or inaccurate in many respects.	Identifies and outlines connections between some of the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research; the connections identified are adequately elucidated.	Makes appropriate, insightful, and powerful connections between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theory and empirical data; effectively integrates multiple sources of knowledge with case information.	
Simply repeats facts identified in the case and does not discuss the relevance of these facts; fails to draw conclusions, or conclusions are not justified or supported; does not present relevant research or data; shows no critical examination of case issues.	Provides an acceptable analysis of most of the issues and problems in the case; in most instances, analysis is adequately supported by theory and empirical data; appropriate conclusions are outlined and summarized.	Presents a balanced, indepth, and critical assessment of the facts of the case in light of relevant empirical and theoretical research; develops insightful and well-supported conclusions using reasoned, sound, and informed judgments.	
	Does not recognize the problems or issues of the case or identifies problems and issues that are not based on facts of the case; displays little understanding of the issues, key problems, and the company's present situation and strategic challenges. Does not identify or explain the perspectives of any stakeholders involved in the case, or explanation is flawed in many respects; fails to recognize any differences between the interests of the various stakeholders. Makes little or no connection between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research, or the connections identified are weak or inaccurate in many respects. Simply repeats facts identified in the case and does not discuss the relevance of these facts; fails to draw conclusions, or conclusions are not justified or supported; does not present relevant research or data; shows no critical examination of case	Does not recognize the problems or issues of the case or identifies problems and issues that are not based on facts of the case; displays little understanding of the issues, key problems, and the company's present situation and strategic challenges. Does not identify or explain the perspectives of any stakeholders involved in the case, or explanation is flawed in many respects; fails to recognize any differences between the interests of the various stakeholders. Makes little or no connection between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research, or the connections identified are weak or inaccurate in many respects. With a few exceptions, identifies and outlines the principal problems and issues in the case; demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the company's issues, current situation, and strategic challenges. With a few exceptions, identifies and outlines tomportates an acceptable understanding of the company's issues, current situation, and strategic challenges. With a few exceptions, identifies and outlines tomportates an acceptable understanding of the company's issues, current situation, and strategic challenges. With a few exceptions, identifies and outlines company's issues, current situation, and strategic challenges. With a few exceptions, identifies and summarizes the perspectives of the principal stakeholders involved in the case; outlines some conflicts of interest between company stakeholders. Identifies and outlines connections between some of the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research; the connections identified analysis of most of the issues and problems in the case; in most instances, analysis is adequately supported by theory and empirical data; appropriate conclusions are outlined and summarized.	Does not recognize the problems or issues of the case or identifies problems and issues that are not based on facts of the case; displays little understanding of the issues, key problems, and the company's present situation and strategic challenges. Does not identify or explain the perspectives of any stakeholders in volved in the case, or explanation is flawed in many respects; fails to recognize any differences between the interests of the various stakeholders. Makes little or no connection between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research, or the connections identified are weak or inaccurate in many respects. Makes little or no connection between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research, or the connections identified are weak or inaccurate in many respects. Makes little or no connection between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research, or the connections identified are weak or inaccurate in many respects. Makes little or no connection between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research; the connections identified are adequately elucidated. Makes little or no connection between some of the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research; the connections between the issues and problems in the case and does not discuss the relevance of these facts; fails to draw conclusions, or conclusions are not justified or supported; does not present relevant research or data; shows no critical examination of case

Action Plans	Has difficulty identifying alternatives and appropriate courses of action; few if any alternatives are presented, infeasible actions are proposed, action plans are not supported, or actions do not address the key issues and problems in the case.	Outlines and summarizes some alternative courses of action to deal with most of the issues and problems in the case; in most instances, proposed action plans are outlined, are feasible, and based on relatively sound theory and evidence.	Effectively weighs and assesses a variety of alternative actions that address the multiple issues central to the case; proposes detailed plans of action; action plans are realistic and contain thorough and well-reasoned justifications.
Comments:			
Evaluations of Consequences	Displays limited awareness and/or understanding of the consequences of action plans; fails to identify implications and consequences of proposed action plans; identified outcomes do not follow from proposed action plans, or outcomes are not related to issues in the case.	Demonstrates acceptable analysis of the results of proposed action plans; adequately outlines and summarizes the implications and consequences resulting from alternative courses of action; with a few minor exceptions, identified consequences of action plans are related to key issues in the case.	Objectively and critically reflects upon alternative plans of action; effectively identifies, thoroughly discusses, and insightfully evaluates the implications and consequences resulting from the proposed action plans; identified consequences are tied to the key issues central to the case.
Comments:			
Total Score			

Note: Adapted from IACBE Case Study Example