Manitoba High School Case Competition – Personal Finance

Scorecard & Feedback

Team:_____

	Score
Problem Identification, Analysis, and Overall Understanding of Case Issues (5)	
Decision Criteria, Alternatives, and Recommendation (5)	
Implementation Plan (10)	
Q & A Session (5)	
Delivery, Slide Design, and Presentation (5)	
Total (30)	

Problem Identification and Overall Understanding of Case Issues	Criteria	Comments
Outstanding 5	- Primary and secondary issues clearly identified, with clear context given. - Issues of critical importance above all else are specifically mentioned. - Critical insights into case are summarized succinctly and then discussed to a superior level. - Identified all or 90%+ of the key issues. - Specific critical analysis given to the nature of the unique person(s) in the case.	
Clearly Above Average 4	- Primary issues clearly identified. - Some secondary issues identified. - Case issues were summarized succinctly, but with some extraneous repetition. - Some insight in the key issues was identifiable, but not to a superior level. - Identified more than 75%+ of key issues.	
Average or Slightly Above Average 3	- Most primary issues identified but not adequately addressed. - Limited secondary issues identified and/or addressed. - Adequate discussion of case details, but there is limited critical understanding. - Identified 60%+ of key issues.	
Below Average to Average 2	- Some issues are identified, but no precedence is given as to primary vs secondary problems. - Very little critical insight beyond repeating of case facts.	
Clearly Below Average 1	- Primary issues not identified. - Secondary issues not identified. - Case facts simply repeated. - Identified less than 50% of key issues.	

Additional Comments:

Decision Criteria, Alternatives & Recommendation	Criteria	Comments
Outstanding 5	- Decision criteria evolves naturally from a discussion about the problems and needs unique to the case. - Decision criteria and alternatives follow a logical sequence. - Evidence used effectively to justify recommendations. - Alternatives are feasible, realistic and tailored to the individual. - Overall recommendation is persuasive, creative, sophisticated, and unique.	
Clearly Above Average 4	- Decision criteria evolves naturally from a discussion about the problems and needs unique to the case. - Decision criteria and alternatives *mostly* follow a logical sequence. - Evidence used effectively to justify recommendations. - Alternatives are *mostly* feasible, realistic and tailored to the individual. - Overall recommendation is mostly persuasive, creative, and unique – if not sophisticated.	
Average to Slightly Above Average 3	- Decision criteria is somewhat related to the problems and needs unique to the case. - Decision criteria and alternatives *somewhat* follow a logical sequence. - Evidence somewhat used effectively to justify recommendations. - Alternatives are *mostly* feasible, realistic and tailored to the individual. - Overall recommendation is somewhat persuasive, creative, and unique.	
Average to Slightly Below Average 2	- Decision criteria largely unrelated to the case. - Alternatives and recommendation largely devoid of evidence, realism, and do not fit individual. - Recommendation is not persuasive or creative.	
Below Average 1	- No recommendation provided, or recommendation is not feasible. - No evidence to support recommendations. - Recommendations are not realistic. - Alternative solutions not identified or discussed.	

Additional Comments:

Implementation Plan	Criteria	Comments
Outstanding 5	- Comprehensive timeline and actionable plan/strategy that fits unique needs and goals of the person(s) in case. - Debt reduction and relevant interest rates are discussed to a sophisticated level. - Budget, savings, and investment goals are identified and discussed to a sophisticated level. - Insurance needs are identified and discussed to a sophisticated level. - Any questions or needs directly identified in the case are addressed to a sophisticated level.	
Clearly Above Average 4	- Comprehensive timeline and actionable plan/strategy that fits unique needs and goals of the person(s) in case. - Debt reduction and relevant interest rates are comprehensively addressed. - Budget, savings, and investment goals are identified and comprehensively addressed. - Insurance needs are identified and comprehensively addressed. - Most of the questions or needs directly identified in the case are addressed comprehensively.	
Average to Slightly Above Average 3	- A somewhat vague timeline and plan/strategy. - Debt reduction and relevant interest rates are somewhat addressed. - Budget, savings and investment goals are identified and somewhat addressed. - Insurance needs are identified and somewhat addressed. - Several of the questions or needs directly identified in the case are largely unanswered.	
Average to Slightly Below Average 2	- Very vague time and plan/strategy. - Debt reduction, savings and & investment, budget, and insurance are not addressed in appropriate depth. - Many questions or needs directly identified in the case are largely unanswered.	
Clearly Below Average 1	- No timeline provided. - Costs/personal budget options are not identified. - Little emphasis given to specific action plan and tasks required to achieve overall strategy.	

Additional Comments:

Q & A Management	Criteria	Comments
Outstanding 5	- Responses during Q & A are balanced and transitions between team members are smooth. - Answers are consistent with recommendations. - Team is creative and/or persuasive in their responses. - Team displays elite ability to "think on their feet".	
Clearly Above Average 4	- Most of the team participated in the Q & A period. - Answers are consistent with recommendations. - Team is mostly convincing in their responses. - Team responds quickly with sufficient details.	
Average to Slightly Above Average 3	- Most of the team participated in the Q & A period. - Answers are mostly consistent with recommendations. - Team is somewhat convincing and timely in their responses.	
Average to Slightly Below Average	- Only one student participated in the Q & A And - Answers are largely inconsistent with recommendations. - There is substantial hesitation and confusion.	
Below Average 1	- Team hesitates in attempting to answer questions. - Questions have not been answered accurately or consistently with recommendation provided. - Team members appear scattered and unprepared to defend their recommendations.	

Additional Comments:

Delivery & Presentation	Criteria	Comments
Outstanding 5	- Team is poised and confident to an elite level. - All members participate. - Clear voices, effective volume, pace, and tone - Engaging body language. - Presentation is professional with minimal spelling/grammatical errors. - Logical flow of creatively-designed slides. - Presentation completed within time limit.	
Clearly Above Average 4	- Team is generally poised and confident. - All members participate. - Clear voices, effective volume, pace, and tone. - Evidence of attention to body language. - Presentation has few spelling/grammatical. errors. - Logical flow of mostly creatively-designed slides. - Presentation completed within time limit.	
Average to Slightly Above Average 3	- Team somewhat poised – somewhat nervous - Most teammates participate. - Distracting body language. - Adequate volume & tone, pace is rushed or sluggish. - Slides are visually adequate and somewhat inspired. - Many grammatical/spelling errors in the slides. - Problems with sequential flow and slides are adequately designed.	
Average to Slightly Below Average 2	- Team is nervous and distracted. - Volume & tone, pace, is rushed or sluggish - Slides are visually adequate and somewhat inspired. - Many grammatical/spelling errors in the slides. - Problems with sequential flow and slide creation.	
Below Average 1	- Team is nervous and lacks confidence. - All members did not speak. - Ineffective body language. - Ineffective volume, tone, pace. - Many grammatical/spelling errors in slides that distract from the presentations.	

Additional Comments: