Rubric Name: Project 1: Case Study
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| **Security and Technology Issues** | **Level 5** | **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** |
| Technology Issues | 10 pointsIdentifies at least 10 security or technology issues based on the case study. | 8 pointsIdentifies at least 8 security or technology issues based on the case study. | 6 pointsIdentifies at least 6 security or technology issues based on the case study. | 3 pointsIdentifies at least 3 security or technology issues based on the case study. The discussion lacked detail and/or was not well supported by information drawn from authoritative sources. | 0 pointsDoesn’t identify any security or technology issues based on the case study.  |
| Security Issues | 10 pointsClearly describes and relates information security and other technology issues to confidentiality, integrity and availability (CIA). Synthesizes and applies material and document relationships. | 8 pointsBasically describes and relates information security and other technology issues to confidentiality, integrity and availability (CIA). Synthesizes and applies some material and document relationships. | 6 pointsWeakly describes and relates information security and other technology issues to confidentiality, integrity and availability (CIA). Some synthesizing and application or applies material and document relationships. | 3 pointsLittle description and relating information security and other technology issues to confidentiality, integrity and availability (CIA). Little synthesizing or application of material and document relationships. The discussion lacked detail and/or was not well supported by information drawn from authoritative sources. | 0 pointsNo description or relationship of information security or other technology issues to confidentiality, integrity and availability (CIA). Doesn’t synthesize or  apply material and document relationships. |
| **Risks and Challengess** | **Level 5** | **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** |
| ID Risks and Challenges | 5 pointsClearly identifies and articulates the risks and challenges from the case study. Links all risks to technologies identified. | 4 pointsBasically identifies and articulates the risks and challenges from the case study. Links most risks to technologies identified. | 2 pointsWeakly identifies and articulates the risks and challenges from the case study. Links few risks to technologies identified. | 1 pointLittle identification or articulation of the risks and challenges from the case study. May not link any risks to technologies identified. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 pointsNo identification or articulation of the risks and challenges from the case study. No links of risks to technologies identified. |
| Apply Risk ID | 10 pointsSynthesizes and applies risk identification and challenges. Derives new paradigms appropriately based on research and lessons learned. | 8 pointsBasically synthesizes and applies risk identification and challenges. Derives some new paradigms appropriately based on research and lessons learned. | 6 pointsWeakly synthesizes and applies risk identification and challenges. Derives few new paradigms appropriately based on research or lessons learned. | 3 pointsLittle synthesis or application of risk identification or challenges. Derives little new paradigms appropriately based on research and lessons learned. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 pointsNo synthesis or application of risk identification or challenges. No new paradigms based on research or lessons learned. |
| **Security Strategy** | **Level 5** | **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** |
| Define Strategy | 5 pointsEach defined strategy solution clearly mitigate the risk or issue. | 4 pointsMost defined strategy solutions basically mitigate the risk or issue. | 2 pointsDefined strategy solutions weakly mitigate the risk or issue. | 1 pointLittle defined strategy solutions mitigate the risk or issue. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 1 pointNo defined strategy solutions that will mitigate any risk or issue. |
| Relate Solutions | 10 pointsClearly identifies security solutions that consist of people, processes and technologies that relate to the risks. Covers all three requirements. | 8 pointsBasically identifies security solutions that consist of people, processes and technologies that relate to the risks. Covers at least two of the three requirements. | 6 pointsWeakly identifies security solutions that consist of people, processes and technologies that relate to the risks. Covers at least one of the requirements. | 3 pointsLittle identification of security solutions that consist of people, processes or technologies that relate to the risks.  May not cover one of the requirements. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 pointsDoesn’t identify security solutions that consist of people, processes or technologies that relate to the risks. Doesn’t cover any of the three requirements. |
| Link Solutions | 5 pointsClearly describes the linkage between each solution and the steps in the case study. | 4 pointsBasically describes the linkage between each solution and the steps in the case study. | 2 pointsWeakly describes the linkage between each solution and the steps in the case study. | 1 pointLittle description of the linkage between each solution or the steps in the case study. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 pointsNo description of any linkage between each solution or steps in the case study. |
| **Timeline** | **Level 5** | **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** |
| Defines Tasks | 5 pointsClear and detailed timeline that summarizes at least 10 of the technology solutions being recommended. Includes clear and defined tasks for each solution.  | 4 pointsBasic and descriptive timeline. Summarizes at least 8 of the solutions being recommended. Includes basic and descriptive tasks for most solutions.  | 2 pointsWeak and poorly detailed timeline. Summarizes at least 6 of the solutions recommended. Includes weak and poorly defined tasks for some solutions. | 1 pointLittle defined timeline. Summarizes at least 3 solutions being recommended. May miss clear and defined tasks for some solutions. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 pointsNo sufficient details in timeline. No summary of solutions being recommended.No clear and defined tasks for each solution.  |
| Prioritize Tasks | 5 pointsMajor tasks are clearly prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks and issues found. | 4 pointsMajor tasks basically prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks or issues found. | 2 pointsMajor tasks weakly prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks and issues found. | 1 pointFew tasks prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks or issues found. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 pointsNo tasks prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks or issues found. |
| Define Resources | 5 pointsClearly defined people resources (by type) that support each task in the timeline. | 4 pointsBasically defined people resources (by type) that support each task in the timeline. | 2 pointsWeakly defined people resources (by type) that support each task in the timeline. | 1 pointLittle defined people resources (by type) that support each task in the timeline. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 pointsNo defined people resources (by type) that support each task in the timeline. |
| **Remediation Plan** | **Level 5** | **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** |
| Mitigation | 5 pointsClearly describes and discusses high level plans that mitigate all technology issues identified. Provides clear detail and rationale to mitigate issues identified. | 4 pointsBasically describes and discusses high level plans that mitigate all technology issues identified. Provides clear detail and rationale to mitigate issues identified. | 2 pointsWeakly describes and discusses high level plans that mitigate all technology issues identified. Provides clear detail and rationale to mitigate issues identified. | 1 pointLittle description or discussion of high level plans that mitigate all technology issues identified. Provides clear detail and rationale to mitigate issues identified. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 pointsNo description or discussion of high level plans that mitigate all technology issues identified. No detail or rationale to mitigate issues identified. |
| Next Steps | 5 pointsClearly describes next steps that must be taken to resolve all issues identified. | 4 pointsBasically describes next steps that must be taken to resolve all issues identified. | 2 pointsWeakly describes next steps that must be taken to resolve all issues identified. | 1 pointLittle description of next steps that may be taken to resolve some issues identified. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 pointsDoesn’t describe next steps that must be taken to resolve all issues identified. |
| **Finds and Applies Knowledge** | **Level 5** | **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** |
| Use of Authoritative Sources | 5 pointsUsed at least 5 authoritative or scholarly sources in paper. No APA style errors in sources. | 4 pointsUsed at least 3 authoritative or scholarly sources in paper. No more than 1 APA errors in sources. | 3 pointsUsed at least 2 authoritative or scholarly sources in paper. No more than 2 APA errors in sources. | 1 pointMay have used 1 authoritative or scholarly source in paper. May not have used APA style formatting. | 0 pointsNo authoritative or scholarly sources used in paper. |
| Citation of Sources | 5 pointsAll sources cited. No errors in citing material in paper. | 4 pointsAll but 1 source cited. Had no more than 5 citing errors in paper. | 2 pointsAll but 2 sources cited. Had no more than 10 citing errors in paper. | 1 pointAll but 3 sources cited. Had less than 15 APA citing errors in paper. | 0 pointsNo sources cited or had more than 15 APA citing errors in paper. |
| **Organization, Execution and Appearance** | **Level 5** | **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** |
| Formatting | 5 pointsPrepared MS Word document, used consistent formatting, section subheadings, submitted one file, used instructor provided template, correct coversheet and separate reference page and meets minimum page count of 5 pages. | 4 pointsMS Word document didn’t follow up to two (2) of the following: used consistent formatting, section subheadings, submitted one file, used instructor provided template, correct coversheet and separate reference page and meets minimum page count of 5 pages.  | 2 pointsMS Word document didn’t follow up to four (4) of the following: used consistent formatting, section subheadings, submitted one file, used instructor provided template, correct coversheet and separate reference page and meets minimum page count of 5 pages.  | 1 pointMS Word document followed only one (1) of the following: used consistent formatting, section subheadings, submitted one file, used instructor provided template, correct coversheet and separate reference page and meets minimum page count of 5 pages.  | 0 pointsNon MS Word document didn’t any of the following: used consistent formatting, section subheadings, submitted one file, used instructor provided template, correct coversheet and separate reference page and meets minimum page count of 5 pages.  |
| Grammar and Punctuation | 5 pointsNo grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors. | 4 pointsLess than 5 grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors.  | 2 pointsLess than 10 grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors.  | 1 pointLess than 15 grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors. | 0 pointsMore than 15 grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors. |
| **Overall Score** | **Level 54 or more** | **Level 43 or more** | **Level 32 or more** | **Level 21 or more** | **Level 10 or more** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

 |