## Individual Case Analytic Rubric – Netflix in India: The Way Ahead

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TRAIT** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **10 Points** | **Meets Expectations**  **8 Points** | **Does not meet Expectations**  **6 Points** |
| **Introduction/**  **Executive Summary** | Thorough summary of case study highlighting significant factors of application research and SWOT analysis | Introductory summary highlighting minor factors of application research and/or SWOT analysis | Poor or no summary submitted |
| **Identifies and Summarizes problem at issue** | Identifies not only the basics of the issue, but recognizes nuances of the issue | Identifies the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem | Does not identify and summarize the problem, is confused or identifies a different or inappropriate problem |
| **Use of SWOT Analysis as Evidence of Critical Thinking** | Excellent detail in SWOT analysis. Writing is characterized by clarity of argument, depth of original insight, and compelling arguments related to strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Should include unusual insights. Arguments are well supported using references. | Some critical thinking is evident, but SWOT tends to address peripheral issues. Technically concise, but could be improved with more creative thought. | Poorly developed SWOT. Analysis does not address necessary components. More analysis and creative thought needed. |
| **Global perspective and position** | Understands multifunctional global issues. Argues pro and con Effectively. Demonstrates value of information. | Presents a narrow/limited perspective of international/global issues Briefly cites data/information Recognizes basic content | Misconstrues issues  Show little or no grasp of international/global issues |
| **Quality of evidence** | Observes cause and effect and addresses existing or potential consequences. Clearly distinguishes between fact, opinion, and acknowledges value judgments | Examines the evidence and source of evidence, questions its accuracy, precision, relevance, and completeness | Merely repeats information provided, taking it as truth or denies evidence without adequate justification |
| **Alternatives & Recommended Course of Action** | Recommendations are directly responsive to problems and provide effective, efficient, feasible recommendations. Responsibilities for actions are included. | Recommendations are adequate but need attention regarding who will implement them, how they’ll be implemented, and what needs to get done. | Recommendations suggest simple solutions (such as outsourcing or hiring consultants) and are vague, unrealistic, expensive, too complex, or not related to problems. |
| **Conclusions, implications, and consequences** | Objectively reflects upon own assertions | Identifies and discusses conclusions, implications, and consequences | Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue |
| **Grammar** | No grammatical errors exist | Some grammatical errors exist but generally don’t impede meaning | Numerous grammatical errors exist and impede meaning |
| **Mechanics** | Report has no punctuation, spelling, or capitalization errors. | Report has some punctuation, spelling, or capitalization errors. | Report has numerous punctuation, spelling, or capitalization errors. |
| **Sentences and Style** | Sentences contain no errors and are diverse and sophisticated. Style is concise and professional. The report has clearly been edited and proofread numerous times. | Sentences contain some errors but don’t impede meaning. Style is generally concise and professional, but some additional editing is warranted | Sentences contain numerous errors and impede meaning. Style is not concise or professional. |