

## ▼ Case Analysis 1-3: Summary, Issues, Stakeholders

3 points

### Criteria Description

Case Analysis 1-3: Summary, Issues, Stakeholders

#### 5. Target

3 points

Analysis skillfully and convincingly summarizes the case, identifies the issues to be resolved, and identifies the stakeholders involved in the issues.

#### 4. Acceptable

2.61 points

Analysis accurately summarizes the case, identifies the issues to be resolved, and identifies the stakeholders involved in the issues.

#### 3. Approaching

2.22 points

Analysis minimally summarizes the case, identifies the issues to be resolved, and identifies the stakeholders involved in the issues.

#### 2. Insufficient

2.07 points

Analysis inadequately summarizes the case, identifies the issues to be resolved, and identifies the stakeholders involved in the issues.

#### 1. No Submission

0 points

Not addressed.

## ▼ Case Analysis 4-5: Laws and Policies

3 points

### Criteria Description

Case Analysis 4-5: Laws and Policies

#### 5. Target

3 points

Identifies compelling existing laws or court rulings and district policies related to the issues.

#### 4. Acceptable

2.61 points

Clearly identifies existing laws or court rulings and district policies related to the issues.

### 3. Approaching

2.22 points

Vaguely identifies existing laws or court rulings and district policies related to the issues.

### 2. Insufficient

2.07 points

Ineffectively identifies existing laws or court rulings and district policies related to

## ▼ Case Analysis 6-8: Solutions and Action Steps

6 points

### Criteria Description

Case Analysis 6-8: Solutions and Action Steps

### 5. Target

6 points

Identifies exceptional solutions to resolve the issues and insightfully selects ideal solutions for resolving the issues. Action steps and timeline are thoughtful and realistic.

### 4. Acceptable

5.22 points

Identifies logical solutions to resolve the issues and appropriately selects solutions for resolving the issues. Action steps and timeline are suitable.

### 3. Approaching

4.44 points

Identifies cursory solutions to resolve the issues and selects partially proficient solutions for resolving the issues. Action steps and timeline are weak.

### 2. Insufficient

4.14 points

Identifies incomprehensible solutions to resolve the issues and selects poor solutions for resolving the issues. Action steps and timeline are irrelevant.

### 1. No Submission

0 points

Not addressed.

## ▼ Case Analysis 9: Consequences

3 points

### Criteria Description

Case Analysis 9: Consequences

**5. Target**

3 points

Moral and legal consequences of proposed solutions are thorough and proficiently explained.

**4. Acceptable**

2.61 points

Moral and legal consequences of proposed solutions are properly explained.

**3. Approaching**

2.22 points

Moral and legal consequences of proposed solutions are missing key details.

**2. Insufficient**

2.07 points

Moral and legal consequences of proposed solutions are incorrectly explained.

**1. No Submission**

0 points

**▼ Rationale**

9 points

**Criteria Description**

Rationale

**5. Target**

9 points

Rationale compellingly explains how the proposed solutions sustain an inclusive school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning; address difficult issues related to meeting students' needs while promoting a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations; evaluates potential moral and legal consequences to make difficult decisions with integrity and fairness; strive to build and sustain positive relationships between school representatives, students, families, and community partners, when their needs conflict; and use technological tools to collect and share professional artifacts that demonstrate aspects of school leadership.

**4. Acceptable**

7.83 points

Rationale reasonably explains how the proposed solutions sustain an inclusive school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning; address difficult issues related to meeting students' needs while promoting a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations; evaluates potential moral and legal consequences to make difficult decisions with integrity and fairness; strive to build and sustain positive relationships between school representatives, students, families, and community partners, when their needs conflict; and use technological

tools to collect and share professional artifacts that demonstrate aspects of school leadership.

### 3. Approaching

6.66 points

Rationale inexplicitly explains how the proposed solutions sustain an inclusive school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning; address difficult issues related to meeting students' needs while promoting a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations; evaluates potential moral and legal consequences to make difficult decisions with integrity and fairness; strive to build and sustain positive relationships between school representatives, students, families, and community partners, when their needs conflict; and use technological tools to collect and share professional artifacts that demonstrate aspects of school leadership.

### 2. Insufficient

6.21 points

Rationale inadequately explains how the proposed solutions sustain an inclusive

## ▼ Organization

1.5 points

### Criteria Description

Organization

### 5. Target

1.5 points

The content is well-organized and logical. There is a sequential progression of ideas that relate to each other. The content is presented as a cohesive unit and provides the audience with a clear sense of the main idea.

### 4. Acceptable

1.31 points

The content is logically organized. The ideas presented relate to each other. The content provides the audience with a clear sense of the main idea.

### 3. Approaching

1.11 points

The content may not be adequately organized even though it provides the audience with a sense of the main idea.

### 2. Insufficient

1.04 points

An attempt is made to organize the content, but the sequence is indiscernible. The ideas presented are compartmentalized and may not relate to each other.

### 1. No Submission

0 points

## ▼ Documentation of Sources

1.5 points

### Criteria Description

citations, footnotes, references, bibliography, etc., as appropriate to assignment and style

#### 5. Target

1.5 points

Sources are completely and correctly documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, and format is free of error.

#### 4. Acceptable

1.31 points

Sources are documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, and format is mostly correct.

#### 3. Approaching

1.11 points

Sources are documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, although several minor formatting errors are present.

#### 2. Insufficient

1.04 points

Documentation of sources is inconsistent or incorrect, as appropriate to assignment and style, with numerous formatting errors

## ▼ Mechanics of Writing

3 points

### Criteria Description

includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, and language use

#### 5. Target

3 points

Submission is virtually free of mechanical errors. Word choice reflects well-developed use of practice and content-related language. Sentence structures are varied and engaging.

#### 4. Acceptable

2.61 points

Submission includes some mechanical errors, but they do not hinder comprehension. A variety of effective sentence structures are used, as well as some practice and content-related language.

#### 3. Approaching

2.22 points

Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language choice (register) and/or word choice are present.

**2. Insufficient**

2.07 points

Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice or sentence construction are used.

**1. No Submission**

0 points

**Total** 30 points