**Notes to the Written Executive Summary Judges**

Thank you for agreeing to judge the competition and for making this a successful learning event for our student members.

* Each team’s written executive summary should be a maximum of two pages, 12 pt. Times New Roman font, single-spaced with 1” margins.
* Specific guidance has been given to the teams with regard to what constitutes an executive summary and what does not (e.g., an outline of the oral presentation).
* In the interest of fairness, all judges are required to make their decisions individually.
* Other than conferring with your judging team members to calibrate scores between teams (for consistency of scoring), please *do not* discuss the teams or their presentations.
* Use the guidance provided by SHRM during the post-training calibration discussion to guide and current team discussions about the teams’ executive summary solutions to the 2016 case.
* The rubric for the Written Executive Summary contains several categories. Each category judged contains a range of points; you may award any number of points within that range based on how well the team met the criteria for the category, but only award whole numbers (e.g., 6, not 6.25 or 6.5).

You will also provide each team narrative comments on the Instantaneous Feedback Form, also in your packet. This form will be given to the teams as part of the feedback process. Scores will not be shared with each team, only rankings (provided by SHRM), and your narrative feedback.

**On behalf of SHRM, we extend our gratitude to you for serving as a Written Executive Summary Judge for the Case Competition and Career Summit.**

**SHRM Case Study Competition**

**Judge's Scoring Rubric for the Written Executive Summary**

**Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Team Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Judge's Organization: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Judging Criteria**

**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.

If problems in the case were overlooked, which problems were they?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Points Awarded, Category 1: \_\_\_

**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.

If causes of the problems in the case were not identified, which causes were not identified?

Implementing a more rigorous hiring process to find employees who fit the culture of the organization and had the experience to handle the department.

Points Awarded, Category 2: \_\_\_

**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.

If the team's solution was poor or inadequate, what important case elements were missing from their solution?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Points Awarded, Category 3: \_\_\_

*(continued)*

**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.

If the team's selection of an alternative was poor or inadequate, what was missing in their explanation?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Points Awarded, Category 4: \_\_\_

**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.

If the implementation plan was not acceptable, where did it fall short?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Points Awarded, Category 5: \_\_\_

**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.

Points Awarded, Category 6: \_\_\_

*(continued)*

**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.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Points Awarded, Category 7: \_\_\_

**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.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Points Awarded, Category 8: \_\_\_

**Total Points Awarded**  \_\_\_

After you calculate total points for the team, save the scoring sheets in MSWord using the file naming protocol provided by SHRM. E-mail one completed scoring rubric for each team’s Written Executive Summary to the SHRM competition management representative *before* the deadline given.

Then, complete an Instantaneous Feedback Form for each team noting your narrative feedback, but no scores. Return the completed Instantaneous Feedback Form with the scoring rubric for each team.

THANK YOU!