

Mgt 455 – Competitive Strategy Final Case Analysis Grading Rubric

Dr. Craig Galbraith

The following rubric will be used as a general guideline for the evaluation of team presentations and case analysis write-up of the MGT 455 competitive strategy case. Remember that the key components of the analysis are: **Define the Issues, Develop Recommendations, Support the Recommendations**. Note that the component areas of a thorough case presentation are listed on the left column, and levels of performance are listed across. This listing can help you better prepare your case analysis and presentation. Evaluation criteria are listed for both the content presentation and the process aspects (e.g., teamwork, presentation style).

Component	Unacceptable (C)	Acceptable (B- to B)	Good (B+)	Excellent (A- to A)
Case Analysis – Content Areas	0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify Issues (concise statement of the major issues confronting the firm)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no issues identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vague statement of issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clear & distinctive set of issues, but only 1 to 3, or some minor issues that are not really important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> full and complete set of important issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External analysis (description of external change drivers: political, economic, demographic, technological, social, legal, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> limited discussion of external factors and/or topic covered in class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-3 factors described, with examples. Only vague reference to class discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> some external issues described, with examples reflecting key processes. Some effort to cover topics discussed in class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good list of external concerns, described, prioritized, show systemic connections with the issues. Clear discussion of topics covered in class,
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal analysis (analysis of the functional departments & relationships: finance, marketing, R&D, manufacturing, HR, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> limited discussion of internal factors and/or topic covered in class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-3 factors described, with examples. Only vague reference to class discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOME internal issues described, with examples reflecting key processes. Some effort to cover topics discussed in class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good list of internal concerns, described, prioritized, show systemic connections with the issues. Clear discussion of topics covered in class,
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of information (Internal Strengths & Weaknesses, external Opportunities & Threats)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no comparison or integration of internal and external factors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> adequate but separate listing of internal and external factors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cross tabulation or other integrated presentation of I/E factors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated presentation of factors with clear implications for strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic alternatives or scenarios 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no alternatives provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> single alternative, vaguely described 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> single alternatives, well described, clearly related to organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> more than one scenario considered, <u>one</u> well described, clearly related to organization.

(possible future scenarios and/or alternative recommendations for responding to strategic needs)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision criteria (bases for deciding on strategic alternatives)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no criteria identified. Limited discussion of class topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> at least one, poorly defined criteria. Vague reference to class topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least two, well defined criteria. Good reference to class topics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clear, well defined, multiple criteria, key factors. Clear and obvious reference to class topics.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation & measurement (identification & measurement of key indicators of performance and change)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no performance evaluation criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> poorly measurable criteria (e.g., specific, behavioral, objective, measurable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clearly measurable criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> key areas, clearly measurable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation & transition management (strategy for reducing resistance to change & facilitating transition for various stakeholders)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no consideration of implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> listed suggestions for implementation and transition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> listed suggestions and explained rationale for implementation and transition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysis of stakeholders, culture, and stages of transition, & dealing with resistance, with corresponding recommendations
Presentation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teamwork (<u>demonstrated</u> ability to work together effectively, cuing, transitions, shared discussion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unclear roles, poor transitions, team tension or conflict apparent, excuses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sequence of individual presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> well coordinated and prepared presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> team members have equivalent roles, smooth transitions, cross references to each other's parts,
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication Style (effective use of voice, gesture, volume, articulation, eye contact, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> barely audible, little inflection, few gestures, little eye contact, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> audible but without enthusiasm, audience contact but little involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clearly audible and enthusiastic but with minimal audience involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> excellent voice projection & modulation, nonverbal expression, enthusiasm eye contact, & involvement of audience
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary (i.e., use of technical terms for content and processes, key figures, etc., related to case and strategic management)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inaccurate use of terms, common or slang rather than technical terms, mispronunciation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inconsistent use of technical and common or slang 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistent use of technical terms; some overuse or pretentiousness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistent use of appropriate terms for all parts of case presentation, discussion and reflection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graphics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no graphics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> used graphics but difficult to read, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> legible, consistent style, related to key ideas, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impactful visual content supplementing verbal points,

(visual materials used to supplement the presentation: transparencies, Power Point slides, chalk/whiteboard diagrams, etc.)		inconsistent style, unnecessary, poor layout	attractive layout	integrates information visually
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of Technology (e.g., Power Point, Internet, overhead projector, TV/video, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no technology used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> technology used but awkward and not tested or with backup 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepared and well organized use of at least one method 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepared and well organized use of 2 methods, supplements presentation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion (interaction with audience to facilitate understanding, elicit questions & concerns, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loosely organized discussion, random questions, some defensiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> elicit audience questions & comments, followup and probe questions, little defensiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> request specific feedback, prepared questions & responses for discussion, actively seek direct feedback with no defensiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflection (team discussion of what was learned, consideration of feedback and critique, areas for revision & improvement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> not covered or no ideas of what could be done differently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loose discussion of possible improvements, explanations why it couldn't be done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clear identification of 1-2 improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clear identification of 3-4 improvements based on feedback, discussion, reflection on team process: what to start, stop, continue

Adapted from College of St. Scholastica, Professor David Swenson.