

# CASE STUDY GUIDELINES

## Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master's Degree in Educational Administration

### Idaho State University

**This document presents guidelines for the analysis of the case study. The current edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA)* must be adhered to for each facet of the case analysis.**

#### **Part 1: The Introduction**

This section is one of the most important parts of the analysis. While there are no specific length requirements, the goal of this section is to present the **statement of the problem(s)**. This section requires a **hint of the review of the literature** and must convince the reader that the analysis has merit and is worth continuing to read (i.e., **it must address the “so what” question** – the significance). In this section, the candidate should gradually begin to integrate related literature, including material covered in the Educational Administration courses. The introduction section is brought to closure by stating the obvious and underlying questions surrounding the case.

#### **Part 2: Literature and Research Review**

The key words for this section are “review” and “extensive.” Use references that fall within the 10-year period of acceptability. While this section may not be as lengthy as in the thesis or dissertation, it should indicate that candidates have reviewed a substantial number of documents related to the case study. Candidates are encouraged to add references from the courses taken in the educational administration program.

#### **Part 3: Proposed Plan of Action**

Clearly define the plan of action proposed to deal effectively with the major issues and problems of the case. This should involve a detailed, **long-range plan** (i.e., 2-3 years) and be presented in a comprehensive and understandable manner. The use of tables and figures is encouraged. Included should be realistic time frames, designation of roles/responsibilities of all stakeholders in the educational community, and an appropriate evaluation program. Candidates are encouraged to include the use of data as a decision making strategy.

#### **Part 4: Discussion/Conclusion**

This section allows the author (candidate) to bring his/her own meaning to the analysis. **Conclusions are drawn, implications presented, and further recommendations made.** Individual perceptions and insights are encouraged.

## **Part 5: References and Appendices**

In the reference section, list all documents introduced within the body of the case analysis. The list of sources is alphabetized and cited in accordance to form and style recommended by *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA Manual) (current edition). Entries suitable for an appendix are items too lengthy or not of sufficient importance to be included in the body of the analysis. Examples of appended items include such things as:

1. form letters
2. questionnaires
3. raw data
4. data analysis
5. test scores

Each appendix is assigned a letter, such as Appendix A, Appendix B, etc., and each of these begins on a new page. A separate title page should be included for each of the appendices.

**Important:** Please present your analysis from the perspective of a building principal. The analysis will include information regarding the superintendent, community members, staff and other stakeholders, but your plan should focus on the role of the building principal.

**Caution:** Candidates cannot engage in the practice of plagiarism, that is, to take another's work and pass it off as one's own. Not only is this illegal and unethical, but it also denies the readers of the analysis, the opportunity to learn of other sources of information. *Plagiarism is grounds for dismissal from the graduate school of education.* Plagiarism does not mean that you cannot consult with others in the class, the building you work in, or other interested parties. It simply means that the written work you submit must be your own, and any material not your own must be cited appropriately (quoted or paraphrased) using APA format.

**Proofing & Editing:** YOU are responsible for making sure the work you turn in has been appropriately proofed (re: spelling, grammar, etc.). Poor quality work may be refused by the Case Study Committee without opportunity to orally present.

# CASE STUDY SCORING RUBRIC

## Master's Degree in Educational Administration Idaho State University

Candidates completing the Case Study option for graduation will be required to receive a passing evaluation by the department in order to successfully move on to graduation in the Department of Educational Leadership. Readers will use the following rubric as a guide in the evaluation of the case study presentations.

### 1 – Pass

- Case presented in clear/definitive sections (i.e., Introduction, Literature Review, Plan of Action, etc.).
- Successfully addressed the knowledge, skills, and dispositions acquired in specialty courses.
- Demonstrated extensive use of references and support material.
- Clearly presented in relationship to the principal.
- Plan of action was realistic, well-constructed, and contained an adequate evaluation component.
- Plan involved all stakeholders (i.e., administrators, teachers, parents, community).
- Demonstrated proficient understanding of specific administrative domains and constructs.
- Ideas were organized effectively.
- Used the conventions of the English language effectively (spelling, usage, punctuation, paragraphing, sentence structure).

### 2 - Pass with Revisions

- Case adequately presented but lacked an element or two structurally (e.g., weak Literature Review or Conclusion).
- Case adequately written and presented, but lacked appropriate references.
- Case presented in an expressive and convincing manner, but less so in terms of organization, insight, and/or language.
- Short of being a “pass” paper, but requires only minor modifications to improve to an acceptable level - pass.

### 3 - Failure

- Failed to address case in regard to the principalship.
- Failed to adequately address “specialty courses.”
- Unacceptable written skills (e.g., weak in content, thought, expression, language facility, and mechanics).
- Candidate failed to defend the case in an acceptable manner during the oral exam.