**2017 SHRM CASE COMPETITION   
WRITTEN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY INSTANTANEOUS FEEDBACK FORM**

The purpose of this instantaneous feedback form is for judges to provide real-time feedback to teams regarding things done well in the written executive summary, as well as opportunities for improvement. The more detail you provide the better!

**Reminder:** **Please print neatly.**

*Action: Provide feedback in the spaces below and return completed feedback sheet to the case competition management team.* *Note that page 2 of this document summarizes how scores are determined; judges, please* ***do not*** *indicate the number of points you awarded on page 2. We provide rankings to teams, not their scores.*

**Competition:** 🞎 East 🞎 Central 🞎 West

**Team Number:**  \_\_ **Date:**

**Role of person providing feedback:** **Written Executive Summary Judge**

What did the team do well in its written executive summary? Please include 3-4 pieces of feedback for the team highlighting what the team did well in their summary. **(Please PRINT neatly.)**

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

What did not go well? Please include 3-4 pieces of feedback for the team highlighting areas the team can improve upon to contribute to better executive summaries in the future. **(Please PRINT neatly.)**

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_

**SHRM Case Competition Written Executive Summary Judging Criteria**

The following general criteria are the ones judges will use to assess your Written Executive Summary. In order to help you understand the expectations of the judges, the maximum number of points that may be awarded in each category is indicated. Note that we do not release scores to teams, only rankings.

**Category 1: Did the team successfully define the major and minor problems presented in the case?**

(17-20 points) The team clearly identified all the major and minor problems presented in the case.

(13-16 points) The team identified nearly all the major and minor problems presented in the case.

(9-12 points) The team identified the major problems but missed some of the minor problems in the case.

(5-8 points) The team missed some of the major and some of the minor problems in the case.

(1-4 points) The team missed most of the significant problems in the case.

**Category 2: Did the team identify and explain the causes of the problems in the case?**

(17-20 points) The team clearly identified, understood and explained the causes of the problems in the case.

(13-16 points) The team clearly identified, understood and explained most of the causes of the problems in the case.

(9-12 points) The team missed some of the significant causes of the problems in the case.

(5-8 points) The team missed most of the causes of the problems in the case.

(1-4 points) The team does not understand the causes of the problems in the case.

**Category 3: Generating various alternatives to the case**

(17-20 points) The team generated a variety of excellent solutions to the case. Solutions were well-explained and demonstrated sound HR principles.

(13-16 points) The team generated good solutions to the case using sound HR principles.

(9-12 points) The team used HR principles to generate a solution to the case.

(5-8 points) The team's solution to the case was weak and HR principles was not well-reflected in the solution.

(1-4 points) The case solution was unknown or poor and HR principles were not incorporated or poorly incorporated into the case solution.

**Category 4: Selecting an alternative**

(9-10 points) The team clearly identified their recommended solution and, using sound HR principles they logically defended why that alternative was chosen instead of other alternatives.

(7-8 points) The team identified their recommended solution and did a good job incorporating HR principles in explaining their alternative.

(5-6 points) The team adequately explained and defended their chosen alternative; however, HR principles played a minor role in the alternative they recommended. (3-4 points) The alternative chosen was weak with little HR involvement in the solution.

(1-2 points) The alternative chosen was poor or inadequate for solving the case and HR principles were either ignored or not appropriate to the solution.

**Category 5: Implementing the chosen alternative**

(5 points) The team's implementation plan was logical, well-explained and a plausible solution to the problems identified in the case.

(4 points) The team's implementation plan was good and presented a workable solution to the case.

(3 points) The team's implementation plan was acceptable but a weak solution to the case.

(2 points) The team's implementation plan addressed some, but not all, of the problems identified in the case.

(1 point) The team's implementation plan was not workable and fell far short of resolving the issues identified in the case.

**Category 6: Written Executive Summary—Arguments and Logic**

(9-10 points) The executive summary presented an excellent discussion of the issues identified in the case. Arguments were presented clearly, well-supported with logic and demonstrated the use of sound HR principles.

(7-8 points) The executive summary was a good discussion of the issues identified in the case. Arguments were presented and explained clearly using good HR principles.

(5-6 points) The executive summary adequately discussed the issues identified in the case. HR principles were used minimally.

(3-4 points) The executive summary missed some important points of the case. Paper lacked organization making arguments difficult to understand. Paper demonstrated minimal use of HR principles.

(1-2 points) A number of important points from the case were missing in the executive summary. Arguments were not well-stated or supported. The paper was poorly organized, not a cohesive unit and as a result, was difficult to understand. HR principles were not included or were used poorly.

**Category 7: Written Executive Summary—Writing and Research**

(9-10 points) The executive summary met the written requirement and was professionally done, cohesive and excellent in writing skill. Research added to the paper with sources used appropriately and correctly cited.

(7-8 points) The executive summary met the written requirements. The paper came together as a single unit with minimal errors. Resources were appropriate and properly cited.

(5-6 points) The executive summary met the written requirements. The paper contained some writing and grammar errors. Paper used minimal research sources; those used were properly cited.

(3-4 points) The executive summary fell somewhat short of the written requirement. The paper contained several writing and grammar errors. Minimal resources were used, with some citations missing or not properly done.

(1-2 points) The executive summary fell short of the written assignment. References not used or used inappropriately and not properly cited.

**Category 8: Overall, would you be comfortable with this team managing the HR function in your organization?**

(5 points) Absolutely - The team was outstanding in all areas. They used sound HR principles to solve the case and demonstrated excellent writing skills.

(4 points) Yes - The team did a good job - Good solution to the case and good written summary.

(3 points) It would be "ok." The team demonstrated adequate HR knowledge in solving the case and summarized their information well.

(2 points) It would make me nervous - The team missed several important points in the case. HR knowledge is limited and writing skills are weak.

(1 point) No. The team is not at a level where I would be comfortable having them represent my company within expectations. Their HR knowledge is too deficient at this stage in their development