Rubric

Name	HRM200 CASE STUDY ESSAY RUBRIC (25 MARKS)
Description	INSTRUCTIONS: Please carefully read the descriptors for each of the assessment criteria. Click the level of achievement you believe the student has achieved then convert the corresponding percentage into mark.

Rubric Detail

	Levels of Achievement				
Criteria	**Below Expectations (Fail) 0-49**	**Meets Expectations (Pass) 50-59**	**Meets Expectations (Credit) 60-69**	**Exceeds Expectations (Distinction) 70-79**	**Exceeds Expectations (High Distinction) 80-100**
Theory-base analysis (30% of 25) **Weight 30.00%**	**0 to 49 %** Key HRM and strategic business theories are poorly understood and linked to the issues/problems in the case study.	**50 to 59 %** Some key HRM and strategic business theories are understood and linked appropriately to the issues/problems in the case study.	**60 to 69 %** Key HRM and strategic business theories are understood and linked appropriately to the issues/problems in the case study.	**70 to 79 %** Key HRM and strategic business theories are understood and linked to the issues/problems in the case study with evidence of critical evaluation.	**80 to 100 %** Key HRM and strategic business theories are understood and linked to the issues/problems in the case study with exceptional critical evaluation.
Evidence-based analysis (30% of 25) **Weight 30.00%**	**0 to 49 %** The analysis was not coherent and based on irrelevant evidence and practice.	**50 to 59 %** A coherent analysis was based on partial use of relevant evidence and practice.	**60 to 69 %** A coherent analysis was based on thorough use of relevant evidence and practice.	**70 to 79 %** A coherent and comprehensive analysis was based on thorough use of the most relevant evidence and practice.	**80 to 100 %** A coherent and complete analysis was based on complete use of all relevant evidence, concepts and practice.
Recommendations and Conclusions (10% of 25) **Weight 10.00%**	**0 to 49 %** Stated general conclusions and/or recommendations which were not fully supported by the analysis and development.	**50 to 59 %** Drew limited conclusions and/or recommendations which followed logically from the analysis and development of explicit elements in the topic.	**60 to 69 %** Drew conclusions and/or recommendations which followed logically from the analysis and development of explicit elements in the topic.	**70 to 79 %** Drew conclusions and/or recommendations which followed logically from the analysis and development of all explicit and some implicit elements evident in the topic.	**80 to 100 %** Drew conclusions and/or recommendations which followed logically from the analysis and development of both explicit and implicit elements evident in the topic.
Clarity of writing and expression. (15 % of 25) **Weight 15.00%**	**0 to 49 %** Ideas and points difficult to comprehend. Paragraphs and sentences were poorly constructed and illogical. Writing was fraught with clichés and misuse of language.	**50 to 59 %** Significant problems with clarity, coherence, and/or consistency. Paragraphs were poorly organised or unfocused. More than an occasional problem with sentence construction, poor word choice, or over reliance on clichés.	**60 to 69 %** Most ideas were clearly expressed, though with some need for improvement. Paragraphs generally coherent, but some were poorly organized or focused. Some problems with sentence construction and/or word choice.	**70 to 79 %** Ideas were generally clearly expressed, perhaps with an occasional lapse in clarity. Paragraphs were generally coherent, sentences mostly well-crafted and varied, and words well-chosen, though perhaps with a couple problems.	**80 to 100 %** Clear, logical, creative expression and well crafted sentences. Paragraphing was coherent and consistent with the ideas being presented. Demonstrated a creative and accurate use of language and phrasing.
Supporting materials and referencing (15% of 25)	**0 to 49 %** The analysis was based very limited sources	**50 to 59 %** The analysis was gathered from several, relevant	**60 to 69 %** The analysis was gathered from several, relevant	**70 to 79 %** The analysis was gathered from many diverse,	**80 to 100 %** The information analysed was gathered from

Weight 15.00%	and did not adopted Chicago referencing style. Less than 10 journal articles	source(s) beyond those provided and requested; and adopted Chicago referencing style appropriatel (but not consistently with some errors). Mimimum 10 journal articles	source(s) beyond those provided and requested; and adopted Chicago referencing style appropriately, accurately and consistently. Minimum 12 journal articles	high quality source(s) beyond those provided and requested; and adopted Chicago referencing style appropriately, accurately and consistently. Minimum 14 journal articles	many diverse, high quality source(s) beyond those provided and adopted; and adopted Chicago referencing style appropriately, accurately and consistently. Minimum 16 journal articles

View Associated Items

Print Close Window