

## Problem Statement [Actor with constraints must decide]

Emerging		Developing	Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5
Does not attempt to or fails to identify and summarize accurately.		Summarizes issue, though some aspects are incorrect or confused. Nuances and key details are missing or glossed over.	Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary, embedded or implicit aspects of the issue. Identifies integral relationships essential to analyzing the issue.	

## Situational Analysis

### SWOT

Emerging		Developing	Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5
Random facts with no coherent meaning.		A collection of facts without thorough thought regarding the importance of the elements in the overall problem.	SWOT has only key elements of the problem organized by internal (SW) and external (OT) [tabular format, properly bulleted]	

## Distinctive Competency

Emerging		Developing	Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5
Fails to include the distinctive competency.		Includes a distinctive competency, but fails to evaluate it fully (VRIN).	Clearly identifies and justifies distinctive competency.	

## Qualitative Feasibility

Emerging		Developing	Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5
No attempt to intuitively consider the feasibility of the problem at hand.		Some attempt to consider the feasibility, but missing key takeaways.	Clearly considers the feasibility of the key elements related to the problem at hand.	

## Quantitative Feasibility

Emerging		Developing	Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5
Data is simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to the problem at hand.		Data is sufficient, although analysis is lacking.	Data is sufficient, and the analysis clearly demonstrates the quantitative feasibility of the options.	

## Options

Emerging		Developing	Mastering	
1	2	3	4	5
Does not attempt to or fails to include options to consider.		Options are identified, but conceptually not categorized.	Options are clearly categorized based on relevance in decision-making process.	

## **Decision/Implementation: [Logical persuasive argument]**

<b>Emerging</b>		<b>Developing</b>	<b>Mastering</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Fails to identify conclusions; conclusion is a simplistic summary rather than a Decisive Implementation.		Presents conclusions as relative and only loosely related to consequences. Decisions may include vague references to conclusions.	Conclusions are qualified as the best available evidence within the context. Consequences are considered and integrated. Implications of Decisive Implementation are clearly developed, considering possible ambiguities.	
Fails to make a decision, or detail the sub-elements of the decision.		Decision is not fully developed and justified based on the key constraints of the problem.  Some detail is explicitly stated regarding the sub-elements of the decision.	Decision is carefully analyzed in relation to other available options. Based on the pros/cons of each option, decision is demonstrated to be superior option.  Decision is describe explicitly, with sub-elements being clearly defined; giving a managerial summary of what should be done, and how it should be done.	

## **Style**

<b>Emerging</b>		<b>Developing</b>	<b>Mastering</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Work is unfocused and poorly organized; lacks logical connection of ideas. Format is absent, inconsistent, or distracting.		Basic organization is apparent; transitions connect ideas, although they may be mechanical. Format is appropriate, although at times inconsistent.	Organization is clear; transistions between ideas enhance the presentation. Consistent use of an appropriate format.	
Grammar, syntax, or other errors are distracting or repeated. Little evidence of proofreading. Style is inconsistent or inappropriate.		Errors are not distracting or frequent, although they may be some problems with more difficult aspects of style and voice.	Errors are minimal. Style is appropriate for audience.	