Candidate Name:

|  | **Level 1**  **Not Acceptable**  **(< 35 pts)** | **Level 2**  **Needs Improvement**  **(35-40 pts)** | **Level 3**  **Meets Standards**  **(40-45 pts)** | **Level 4**  **Exceeds Standards**  **(45-50 pts)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Candidate Identifies main Issue of the Case Study**  NELP: 1.2, 4.4, 6.2, 7.4 | Candidate inadequately defines the scope of the case study which results in an accurate identification of the issue:   * No clear description of the issue; * Narrative does not adequately define the scope of the case study; | Candidate demonstrates an implicit link between the case study and the issue:   * Problem is not well defined; * Main issue is somewhat defined; * The response partially addresses the issue at hand; | Candidate uses the narrative to accurately describe the issue. Yet, does not operationally define issue:   * Description of the issue is clearly defined in the narrative; * Response generally fulfills the purpose of the case study based upon data use; * Description is accurate and prevalent to the narrative; | Candidate uses information derived from the case study to accurately identify the issue:   * The main issue is completely addressed and well defined; * Main issue is accurately portrayed to the reader through use of data inside the case study; * Student is able to decipher situation to accurately identify main issue; |
| **Rating =** |  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate Analyzes the main Issue(s)**  NELP: 1.2, 2.1-2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 6.2 | Candidate does not identify main issue:   * Student does not define or address the issue within the case study; * Response fulfills little of the intended item within the scenario; * Breakdown of issue is not prevalent; | Candidate identifies the main issue but does not provide an effective or complete analysis:   * Analysis is not well addressed or defined/ * The analysis is partially addressed but main components are lacking; * Some components are addressed but main issue is lacking; | Candidate defines the main issue in a general way with smaller components missing:   * Issue is defined in a general way to address the task within the case study; * Analysis of the main issue is addressed with some smaller components lacking; * Analysis recognizes needed supports that need to be implemented; | Candidate effectively analyzes main issue in the case study:   * Analysis of the main issue is addressed and defined; * Analysis of issue is accurately defined and prevalent; * Well defined issue that addresses the main issue and sub parts of the issue is evident; |
| **Rating = /** |  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate addresses an Action Plan and responds appropriately to each specific task within the plan)**  NELP: 2.2, 3.2, 5.1-5.3, 6.3, 7.4 | * Candidate’s Action plan is not clear and Systematic; * Candidate’s Action plan is not guided by relevant theories and processes; * Candidate’s Description of action/intervention is not present or unclear; | * Candidate’s Action plans for addressing the initial problem are clear **or** systematic but not both; * Candidate’s Action and assessment plans are marginally guided by relevant educational leadership practices; * Candidate thoughts are not well thought through in terms of the educational leadership; | * Candidate’s Action plan is clear and identifiable; * Candidate’s Action plan provides relevant content knowledge and proven strategies; * Candidate’s Data is evident and action plan is derived from a collaborative approach with stakeholders; | * Candidate’s Action plan is well defined and derived from content knowledge and skills acquired including ethical and legal standards; * Candidate’s action plan benefited from collaborating with diverse stakeholders in addressing the issue; * Candidate’s Action plan provides examples and specific items relevant to educational leadership; |
| **Rating = /** |  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate uses EDL Terminology and applies Relevant Content Knowledge**  NELP: 4.3, 5.2, 6.2 | Candidate response has the following items:   * EDL terms and content knowledge is not evident; * Data used is not noticeable and reinforced in the writing; * EDL Terminology is non-existent; | Candidate response has the following items:   * EDL terms are somewhat prevalent and identifiable; * Terms are limited and only partially used in the response; * Partial interpretation of data; | Candidate response has the following components:   * EDL terms are used and are appropriate for the purpose and scope of the study; * EDL terms are used effectively and accurately in the case study response; * EDL terms are evident but not total defined within a collaborative approach to the case study; | * Candidate response completely fulfills the assignment by the use of multiple EDL terms accurately and content knowledge is prevalent; * Candidate shows a collaboration of all stakeholders; * Candidate uses EDL terms and content knowledge to help provide an accurate solution to the case study; |
| **Rating = /** |  |  |  |  |
| **Candidate applies appropriate level writing in their response**  NELP: 1.2, 4.1, 5.2, 5.3 | * Answer is not accurately written; * EDL language not used; * Poorly organized; * Unclear; | Some but not all of the following:   * demonstrates ability to use academic language; * clear focus, well organized; * conceptual clarity; | * Demonstrates ability to use academic language; * Clear focus, well organized; * Conceptual clarity; * Length may not fall into the required number of words; | * Clearly developed answer that produces well rounded answer in the allotted length; * Concepts and knowledge is prevalent in the writing; * Well organized answer; |
| **Rating = /** |  |  |  |  |
| **Total points =**  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |  |  |  |
| **COMMENTS** |  | | | |