**Rubric for Written Case Study** Name of Team \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristics of Plan** | **Excellent**  **5** | **Above Average**  **4** | **Average**  **3** | **Below Average**  **2** | **Poor**  **1** | **Importance Factor** | **Points Earned** |
| **Looked professional and was easily navigable** (e.g. table of contents; section dividers; page numbers; clear text references to appendices; appendices clearly labeled, etc.) | Well organized and professional; Extraordinary attention to detail | Above average appearance, attention to detail and ease of navigation | Average appearance, attention to detail and ease of plan navigation | Needs attention to appearance, attention to detail and ease of plan navigation | Haphazard construction. No attention to detail. Lacked any form Plan difficult to navigate | **1** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/5** |
| **Included a summary to facilitate understanding and implementation** (e.g., executive summary, “to-do” list, timeline, etc.) | Integrated, clear, concise, responsible guidance with sound priorities | Summary or other tools provided, but not integrated *OR* lacked sufficient detail | Provided simple executive summary *OR* 5 Ws/how/how much table only | Summary not very helpful because it failed to prioritize tasks or lacked detail | Summary not included | **1** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/5** |
| **Addressed client goals and questions**; Used them to guide the plan, even if the goal(s) was not achievable as originally stated by the client | All goals and questions were fully considered and/or planned for | Most goals clearly guided the plan and most questions fully addressed | Goals generally guide the plan; several questions overlooked | Some goals redefined without full regard for the client; Some questions overlooked | Many goals not addressed or inference that the goals were insignificant; Questions ignored | **3** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/15** |
| **Was factually accurate** (e.g., data manipulation; related content) | All information is consistent, accurate, and fully integrated | Few, minor errors and only a major error in 1 content area | Multiple errors (major and minor) in 1-2 content areas | Errors in multiple content areas | Significant errors that compromise the plan | **2** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/10** |
| **Provided accurate and transparent analysis** for cash flow; taxes; insurance (life, health, disability, LTC, P&C); retirement; estate; education and/or other special needs | Accurate and clear analysis and synthesis in most content areas | Accurate and clear analysis and synthesis, with only minor errors or omissions | Most analysis accurate, with only a major error in 1 content area or multiple minor errors/omissions | Some analysis inaccurate or incomplete, with several major and minor errors/omissions | Inaccurate or incomplete analysis of several content areas compromise the plan | **3** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/15** |
| **Characteristics of Plan** | **Excellent**  **5** | **Above Average**  **4** | **Average**  **3** | **Below Average**  **2** | **Poor**  **1** | **Importance Factor** | **Points Earned** |
| **Provided clear, actionable recommendations** (5 Ws, how, how much) for cash flow; taxes; insurance (life, health, disability, LTC, P&C); retirement; estate; education and/or other special needs | Original and creative recommendations in most areas; alternative recommendations offered | Most recommenda-tions clear and actionable; only a few alternatives offered | Most recommendations clear and actionable, with only minor errors/omissions | Some recommendations actionable; several major errors/omissions | Several recommendations are not clear or actionable; several major errors/omissions | **3** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/15** |
| **“Spoke” to the client** (e.g., writing style, use of visuals, organization, emotional messages, compliments) to make the client feel known and understood by the advisors | Excellent empathic tone to support the client and foster the relationship | Several examples of client “connections” throughout the plan | Appropriate balance of factual data, with some warmth or client empathy and motivation | Ineffective attempts to connect with or motivate the client | Factual, impersonal tone; Lacked empathy to connect or motivate | **1** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/5** |
| **Total Written** |  | | | | | | **/70** |

Name of Team \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Rubric for Oral Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristics of Presentation** | **Excellent**  **4** | **Above Average**  **3** | **Average**  **2** | **Poor**  **1** | **Importance Factor** | **Points Earned** |
| **Connection between recommendations and clients’ priorities/objectives** | Recommendations  directly related to the clients’ priorities and objectives | Recommendations  mostly related to the clients’ priorities and objectives | Recommendations only remotely related to the clients’ priorities and objectives | Recommendations  did not relate to the clients’ priorities and objectives | **2** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/8** |
| **Rationale/**  **Recommendations** | The relevant pros and cons of the recommendations were articulated | Most of the relevant pros and cons of the recommendations were articulated | Few of the relevant pros and cons of the recommendations were articulated | None of the relevant pros and cons of the recommendations were articulated | **3** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/12** |
| **Clarity, Organization and Scope of Presentation (e.g., amount and level of content presented)** | Presented in a logical, interesting sequence at a level that the client could easily follow. Introduction of each team member. | Logical sequence and level that the client could follow | Client would most likely have difficulty following the explanation due to sequencing or level– too elementary or too sophisticated. | Client would not understand the plan due to issues with sequencing and scope of the presentation | **2** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/8** |
| **Visuals:** Appearance, Content and Use Should Enhance the Presentation (e.g., PowerPoint, handouts, computer-generated materials, etc.) | Attractive, consistently formatted with a professional appearance (e.g. easily read, not cluttered or distracting);  Appropriate content; No misspellings or grammatical errors | Nice, but lacked a professional appearance; Content (amount and/or usefulness) in question; Few misspellings, grammatical errors, or other issues with clarity. | Average appearance and issues with the scope of content; Severalmisspellings, grammatical errors, or other issues with clarity. Difficult to see, read, understand message. | Visuals were of poor quality and did not contribute to the plan presentation*. OR*  NO visuals used. | **2** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/8** |

Name of Team \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristics of Presentation** | **Excellent**  **4** | **Above Average**  **3** | **Average**  **2** | **Poor**  **1** | **Importance Factor** | **Points Earned** |
| **Delivery:** Eye contact, pace of delivery, gestures, movement, facial expressions, vocal variety, posture, lack of distracting mannerisms (verbal or other) or biases | Professional; made the client (judges) feel comfortable with no biases. Clear voice; careful pronunciation. Good eye contact with the clients. Appropriate gestures | Clear voice, with most words pronounced correctly. Maintained eye contact with clients. Few distractions (mannerisms or biases) | Punctuation not always clear; judges had difficulty hearing. Poor eye contact with judges. Some distractions (mannerisms or biases). | Mumbled or read; unclear pronunciation, and/or spoke too quietly/quickly for client to hear. Poor eye contact; distracting mannerisms or biases | **2** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/8** |
| **Professional Appearance:** Appearance is neat, clean, professional and appropriate for the situation. | Personal appearance is professional and appropriate for the occasion. Attire was chosen to enhance presentation. | For the most part, personal appearance is professional and appropriate for the occasion. | Personal appearance is somewhat unprofessional and inappropriate for the occasion. | Personal appearance is unprofessional and inappropriate for the occasion: e.g. jeans, t-shirt. | **1.5** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/6** |
| **Creativity:** with regard to visuals and oral presentation | Used lots of creativity in either the visual or oral presentation to help bring the recommendations to life and enhance understanding | Used some creativity in either the visual or oral presentation to help bring the recommendations to life and enhance understanding. | Used little creativity in either the visual or oral presentation to help bring the recommendations to life and enhance understanding. | Demonstrated no creativity in either the visual or oral presentation to help bring the recommendations to life and enhance understaninding. | **1** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/4** |
| **Involvement of all members in presentation and responding to questions (to extent judges’ questions permitted)** | All members were involved to approximately same degree in both presentation and responding to questions | All members were involved, although there was some imbalance among members in presentation and responses | There was a clear imbalance with at least one member contributing little to presentation and/or responses | There was a clear imbalance with one member dominating in both presentation and responding to questions | **3** | **Rubric Rank x Importance Factor = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/12** |
| **Total Oral** |  | | | | | **/66** |

Total from Written presentation \_\_\_\_\_\_ + Total from Oral Presentation \_\_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_\_out of 136 Name of team\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_