Rubric for Scoring Case Analyses

ISSUES

1.1
• This analysis demonstrates recognition of multiple problems in the case (2 points)
• This analysis only recognizes one problem in the case. (1 point)
• This analysis does not recognize any problems. (0 points)

1.2
• This analysis indicated that some issues are of more importance than others and explained why. (2 points)
• This analysis demonstrated that some issues are of more importance than others but did not explain why (1 point)
• This analysis did not demonstrate recognition that one issue might be more important than others nor did it explain why. (0 points)

1.3
• The problems mentioned were based on the facts in the case. (1 point)
• The problems mentioned were not based on the facts in the case or skewed the facts in the case in some way. (0 points)

1.4
• The analysis focused on problems identified as important. (1 point)
• The analysis focused on problems that were not of importance. (0 points)
• The analysis did not focus on any problems. (0 points)

PERSPECTIVES

2.1
• The analysis recognizes the perspectives of multiple characters in the case. (2 points)
• This analysis recognizes the perspective of only one character in the case. (1 point)
• This analysis did not recognize the perspectives of any characters in the case. (0 points)

2.2
• This analysis recognizes that individuals have unique perspectives. (1 point)
• This analysis does not recognize that individuals have unique perspectives. (0 points)

2.3
Knowledge of the situation Feelings Values
• The analysis considers three of three of these for the perspectives they recognize. (3 points)
• The analysis considers two of three of these for the perspectives they recognize. (2 points)
• The analysis considers one of the three of these for the perspectives they recognize. (1 point)
• The analysis considers none of these three. (0 points)

2.4
• The analysis considered the perspectives of individuals who were related to the problems mentioned as most important. (1 point)
• The analysis considered the perspectives multiple individuals but they were not related to the problems mentioned as most important. (0 points)
KNOWLEDGE

3.1
- The analysis recognizes that there might be more information available than is present in the case- it raises questions about information that might be missing or ambiguous. (1 point)
- The analysis does not demonstrate the problem-solver's recognition that more information might be needed to analyze the case- no questions are asked about missing information. (0 point)

3.2
Knowledge from personal experience | Knowledge from empirical research
Knowledge from theoretical research
- This analysis considers information from three of these knowledge sources. (3 points)
- This analysis considers information from two of these knowledge sources. (2 points)
- This analysis considers information from one of these knowledge sources. (1 point)
- This analysis does not consider information from any of these sources. (0 points)

3.3
- The analysis uses facts from the case. (1 point)
- The analysis does not use facts from the case. (0 point)

3.4
- The analysis uses facts from the case materials. (1 point)
- The analysis does not use facts from the related case materials. (0 point)

3.5
- The facts the analysis highlights from the case are used accurately. (2 points)
- The facts the analysis highlights from the case are not used accurately. (1 point)
- The analysis does not use any knowledge of this kind. (0 points)

3.6
- The facts the analysis uses from the related case materials are used accurately. (2 points)
- The facts the analysis uses from the related case materials are not used accurately. (1 point)
- The analysis does not use any knowledge of this kind. (0 points)

3.7
- The knowledge the case uses seems to be related to the problems identified as most important. (1 point)
- The knowledge the case uses does not seem to be related to the problems identified as most important. (0 points)

ACTIONS

4.1
- More than one action was proposed. (2 points)
- One action was proposed. (1 point)
- No actions were proposed. (0 points)

4.2
- The analysis proposed actions that seemed reasonable. (2 points)
- The analysis proposed actions that did not seem reasonable. (1 point)

4.3
- The actions proposed seem feasible. (1 point)
- The actions proposed do not seem feasible. (0 points)
4.4
- The actions proposed seem deal with the problems deemed the most important. (1 point)
- The actions proposed do not seem to deal with the problems deemed the most important. (0 point)

CONSEQUENCES

5.1
- The analysis mentioned positive consequences for the actions they suggested. (1 point)
- The analysis did not mention positive consequences for the actions they suggested. (0 points)

5.2
- The analysis mentioned negative consequences for the actions they suggested. (1 point)
- The analysis did not mention negative consequences for the actions they suggested. (0 points)

5.3
- The consequences suggested seem to be tied to the issues deemed of most importance. (1 point)
- The consequences suggested do not seem to be linked to the issues deemed most important. (0 points)

STYLE

- The paper was well written meaning that it had no misspellings or obvious grammatical errors. (1 point)
- The paper was not well written and did have either misspellings or obvious grammatical errors. (0 points)

- The paper was coherent and "stuck together." (1 points)
- The paper was not coherent and did not "stick together." (0 points)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presents an accurate and detailed description of a variety of problems and opportunities that is compelling and insightful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays no or little social sensitivity. May be stereotyping or generalizing about groups. Little regard for the perspectives of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceives few or limited alternative actions described that address fully the spectrum of issues raised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays limited awareness of consequences of actions and/or broader social outcomes of decisions and actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSPECTIVES</th>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manifests concern for equity and analyzes case with view toward respecting persons. Seeks to understand position of others and generally succeeds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates no or little social sensitivity. May be stereotyping or generalizing about groups. Little regard for the perspectives of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays no or little social sensitivity. May be stereotyping or generalizing about groups. Little regard for the perspectives of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays no or little social sensitivity. May be stereotyping or generalizing about groups. Little regard for the perspectives of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presents a balanced and critical view of multiple sources of knowledge (personal experience, theory and research, facts) to create criteria for informed judgments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers a variety of actions that address the multiple issues present in the case.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSEQUENCES</th>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes the complex, interactive nature of educational actions and decisions and draws attention to the broader social consequences related to schooling and education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates uncritical dependence on authority or experts OR on gut instinct to the exclusion of other sources of evidence or better reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>