



**OMDS Module 5**  
**Case Study Rubrics**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exemplary 5 Points</b>	<b>Proficient 4 Points</b>	<b>Adequate 3 Points</b>	<b>Needs Improvement 2 Points</b>	<b>Insufficient 1 Point</b>
<b>Case Study Summary (250–300 words)</b>	Comprehensive, clear, and concise summary of the case. Key events are well-organized and provide a solid understanding of the issue.	Summary is clear and covers the main events of the case but lacks depth or detail in some areas.	Summary is somewhat clear but may lack important details or logical flow.	Summary is unclear or overly brief, with significant gaps in detail or understanding.	No summary provided or summary is too incomplete to assess.
<b>Stakeholders and Impact (250–300 words)</b>	Identifies three to five stakeholders with clear, well-explained connections to the case. Impact on each stakeholder is thoughtfully and thoroughly described.	Identifies three to five stakeholders with adequate explanation of their connection to the case. Impact is described but lacks depth in analysis.	Identifies three stakeholders with some explanation of their connection to the case but lacks clear analysis of impact.	Identifies fewer than three stakeholders or provides minimal explanation and analysis of the impact on stakeholders.	Fails to identify stakeholders or provide meaningful analysis of their impact.
<b>Broader Issues in Technology and Ethics (250–300 words)</b>	Provides a well-reasoned explanation of how the case study exemplifies broader ethical and technological issues. Strong connections made to related case studies or examples.	Explains how the case study relates to broader issues, but connections to ethical or technological concerns lack depth. Mentions related case studies.	Touches on broader issues but does not fully explain the significance. Limited reference to related case studies.	Explanation is unclear or lacks connection to broader ethical or technological issues. No reference to related case studies.	Fails to address broader issues or provide a coherent explanation.

<b>Argument for Importance (150–200 words)</b>	Presents a clear, well-reasoned argument for why this case study deserves attention. Convincing and supported by evidence.	Argument is clear but may lack depth or strength of evidence. Still demonstrates the case study's importance.	Argument is present but lacks clarity or depth. The significance of the case study is not fully supported.	Argument is weak or unclear. The case study's importance is not convincingly established.	No argument presented or argument is too incomplete to assess.
<b>Writing Quality</b>	Writing is clear, professional, and free from errors. Ideas are well-organized, and word count is within the assigned range.	Writing is clear with minor errors but generally professional and organized. Word count is close to the assigned range.	Writing has some clarity but contains noticeable errors. Organization may be lacking. Word count may not fully meet the requirements.	Writing is unclear or contains frequent errors. Organization is poor, and word count is significantly outside the assigned range.	Writing is too unclear to assess or does not meet the basic requirements of the assignment.
<b>Formatting and Submission</b>	Case study is properly formatted for the online repository, includes author's name, and meets all submission guidelines.	Case study is mostly well-formatted and meets submission guidelines, with minor issues.	Case study meets some formatting and submission guidelines but contains noticeable issues.	Case study does not follow many formatting or submission guidelines.	Case study does not meet formatting or submission guidelines.
<b>Appendix on AI Use</b>	Appendix clearly and thoroughly documents GenAI usage or non-usage. Includes (a) full exchanges with AI tools, (b) identification of tools used, (c) descriptions of how and why they were used, and (d)	Appendix is present and mostly complete, with minor omissions in documentation or reflection. GenAI use is acknowledged, but some details may be vague or incomplete.	Appendix includes basic documentation but lacks depth or completeness. May be missing one or more elements (e.g., full exchanges, rationale, or	Appendix is present but significantly underdeveloped. Major components are missing or unclear. GenAI use is poorly explained or	Appendix does not address GenAI usage in any meaningful way. No acknowledgment or reflection is provided.



	thoughtful reflection on impact. Proper credit is given, and work demonstrates critical engagement.		reflection), and critical engagement is limited.	inconsistently documented.	
Total: ____ /35 points					

**Note:** Failure to submit the required **appendix on GenAI use** may result in a **deduction of up to 5%** from the total assignment grade.