**Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Meets Expectations** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** |
| **Case Study 1** (~35%) | All the answers for the tab on the WHY analysis as well the HFACs framework are addressed properly based on the references. All the questions are answered and the file is submitted in a clean and neat manner in the Excel file provided for filling the answers. The root causes for the WHY are based on the information provided in the required references for that part and the problem statement. | All the answers for the tab on the WHY analysis as well the HFACs framework are NOT addressed properly based on the references.    All the questions are NOT answered and the file is NOT submitted in the proper format.    The root causes for the WHY are NOT based on the information provided in the required reference for that part and the problem statement. |
| **Case Study 2**(~20%) | All the questions are filled for the Complex Data and the Home Universe conversation and the word file is returned back as a PDF. | All the questions are NOT filled for the Complex Data and the Home Universe conversation and the word file is NOT returned back as a PDF. |
| **Case Study 3**(~20%) | The questions in each of the 7Ps are answered based on the references provided. The answers are written in the same word file shared and returned back as a PDF. The answers should be crisp and concise but should also be meaningful, but wherever asked to justify, explanations are provided. | The questions in each of the 7Ps are NOT answered based on the references provided. The answers are NOT written in the same word file shared and returned back as a PDF. The answers are not crisp and concise and are also very vague and not meaningful. No proper explanation is provided wherever justify the answer is mentioned. |
| **Case Study 4** (~20%) | The questions framed for the 5Ws + How analysis for each of the 6 entities are meaningful and not vague. The questions are also focused or asked based on the entity/operation in focus and not absurd. The questions crafted should be crisp and concise and should be derived from a meaningful understanding of the problem statement given. | The questions framed for the 5Ws + How analysis for each of the 6 entities are NOT meaningful and crisp and concise. The questions are also NOT focused or asked based on the entity/operation in focus. |
| **Readability of the Submitted Answer Copy** (~5%) | The answers are readable and documented in the proper format required. The overall document is neat and easy to read. The submitted file is in Excel/PDF and not in any other format. | The answers are NOT readable and documented in the proper format required. The overall document is difficult to read and thus evaluate.  The submitted file is NOT in the format required. |

**Submission**

For submissions obtained within one week after the deadline, there will be a 30% penalty. Submissions beyond one week after the deadline will not be accepted.

**Submissions required**

Resubmitting the Excel file provided in case study 1 along with the required answers in both the tabs i.e. the Analysis as well as HFACs tab.

Resubmitting the conversation document with the required questions filled in places where "----" is mentioned.

Resubmitting the required set of answers required for the questions asked in each of the 7Ps in the 3rd case study.

Resubmitting the document for the 4th case study where the questions for the 5Ws + How are filled for the required entities in the WalStore operations.

**Please Note:** All the documents for the case studies 2, 3 and 4 should be merged as 1 final document and then exported as a PDF.

**You need to share the PDF file (consisting of case studies 2,3, and 4's answers) along with the Excel (consisting of case study 1's answers) in a zip folder and add that in the submission window provided below.**