Grading criteria for comm486M mini cases.

Note: Presentation is a group mark worth 20% of term and the assessment and Q&A is an individual mark worth 5%.

<u>Presenting teams</u>
Grading criteria:
- Evidence of good research to uncover relevant data for the case at hand.
- Demonstration of thoughtful and relevant use of specific strategy tools to undertake analysis.
- Clear communication of a systematic process of analysis and recommendations, (both verbally and in slides.)
- Good use of all team members.
- Effective time management.
- Thoughtful handling of Q&A, demonstrating anticipation and preparation of likely questions.

It is expected that teams presenting later in the term will be able to use more tools and do stronger work. Grading standards will flex to allow for earlier teams knowing less material. Cases and expectations of work level rise through the term.

-EE (exceeds expectations): 85%+ will show strong performance on all of the grading criteria, with a high quality of work throughout.

-ME (meets expectations): 77% will show good capability on most of the grading criteria, but there will be some gaps in quality and/or inconsistencies.

-NI (needs improvement) 60-70% will have quite a few gaps in content and/or lower quality, reflecting lack of research or understanding in analysis. Other reasons for lower scores might be poor time management, poor slides and/or poor delivery, reflecting a lack of preparation.

-F: 0-50%. This would reflect work from a team that has not undertaken relevant research and analysis and/or is very ineffective in presentation and Q&A.

<u>Reviewing individuals</u>

Scoring for worksheets: a single grade as a % for the 2 worksheets, entered onto Connect before the next case, with one page of overall comments as feedback.

-EE (exceeds expectations): 85%+ strong insight, good use of tools, shows evidence of research prior to presentations. Has good understanding of business model and competitive advantage of strategies being discussed. Linked strategy tools to strategic situation in case. Fully articulated the basis of the score given for each category of evaluation.

-ME (meets expectations): 77% demonstrates understanding of industry background and proposes thoughtful questions. Limited use of strategy tools in assessment. Explained why marks were given and questions indicated a good understanding of the case and the specific presentation that was given. Note: we are looking for more than opinion and reaction.

-NI (needs improvement) 60-70% Some reasonable points but ad hoc and mainly reactionary. Does not show deeper understanding that good preparation would indicate. Lacks use of relevant tools or insight. Poor use of strategy tools in assessment and did not fully justify with explanation the scores provided.

-F: 0-50%. Missing papers score zero. Superficial or simply opinion based comments score in this range, going towards zero if they show a lack of fundamental understanding or lack of preparation.