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 points  Identifies at least 10 security or technology issues based on the case study. | 8 points  Identifies at least 8 security or technology issues based on the case study. | 6 points  Identifies at least 6 security or technology issues based on the case study. | 3 points  Identifies 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 points  Doesn’t identify any security or technology issues based on the case study. | | Security Issues | 10 points  Clearly describes and relates information security and other technology issues to confidentiality, integrity and availability (CIA). Synthesizes and applies material and document relationships. | 8 points  Basically describes and relates information security and other technology issues to confidentiality, integrity and availability (CIA). Synthesizes and applies some material and document relationships. | 6 points  Weakly 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 points  Little 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 points  No 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 points  Clearly identifies and articulates the risks and challenges from the case study. Links all risks to technologies identified. | 4 points  Basically identifies and articulates the risks and challenges from the case study. Links most risks to technologies identified. | 2 points  Weakly identifies and articulates the risks and challenges from the case study. Links few risks to technologies identified. | 1 point  Little 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 points  No identification or articulation of the risks and challenges from the case study. No links of risks to technologies identified. | | Apply Risk ID | 10 points  Synthesizes and applies risk identification and challenges. Derives new paradigms appropriately based on research and lessons learned. | 8 points  Basically synthesizes and applies risk identification and challenges. Derives some new paradigms appropriately based on research and lessons learned. | 6 points  Weakly synthesizes and applies risk identification and challenges. Derives few new paradigms appropriately based on research or lessons learned. | 3 points  Little 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 points  No 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 points  Each defined strategy solution clearly mitigate the risk or issue. | 4 points  Most defined strategy solutions basically mitigate the risk or issue. | 2 points  Defined strategy solutions weakly mitigate the risk or issue. | 1 point  Little defined strategy solutions mitigate the risk or issue. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 1 point  No defined strategy solutions that will mitigate any risk or issue. | | Relate Solutions | 10 points  Clearly identifies security solutions that consist of people, processes and technologies that relate to the risks. Covers all three requirements. | 8 points  Basically identifies security solutions that consist of people, processes and technologies that relate to the risks. Covers at least two of the three requirements. | 6 points  Weakly identifies security solutions that consist of people, processes and technologies that relate to the risks. Covers at least one of the requirements. | 3 points  Little 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 points  Doesn’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 points  Clearly describes the linkage between each solution and the steps in the case study. | 4 points  Basically describes the linkage between each solution and the steps in the case study. | 2 points  Weakly describes the linkage between each solution and the steps in the case study. | 1 point  Little description of the linkage between each solution or the steps in the case study. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 points  No 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 points  Clear and detailed timeline that summarizes at least 10 of the technology solutions being recommended. Includes clear and defined tasks for each solution. | 4 points  Basic and descriptive timeline. Summarizes at least 8 of the solutions being recommended. Includes basic and descriptive tasks for most solutions. | 2 points  Weak and poorly detailed timeline. Summarizes at least 6 of the solutions recommended. Includes weak and poorly defined tasks for some solutions. | 1 point  Little 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 points  No sufficient details in timeline. No summary of solutions being recommended.  No clear and defined tasks for each solution. | | Prioritize Tasks | 5 points  Major tasks are clearly prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks and issues found. | 4 points  Major tasks basically prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks or issues found. | 2 points  Major tasks weakly prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks and issues found. | 1 point  Few tasks prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks or issues found. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 points  No tasks prioritized according their importance to mitigating the risks or issues found. | | Define Resources | 5 points  Clearly defined people resources (by type) that support each task in the timeline. | 4 points  Basically defined people resources (by type) that support each task in the timeline. | 2 points  Weakly defined people resources (by type) that support each task in the timeline. | 1 point  Little defined people resources (by type) that support each task in the timeline. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 points  No 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 points  Clearly describes and discusses high level plans that mitigate all technology issues identified. Provides clear detail and rationale to mitigate issues identified. | 4 points  Basically describes and discusses high level plans that mitigate all technology issues identified. Provides clear detail and rationale to mitigate issues identified. | 2 points  Weakly describes and discusses high level plans that mitigate all technology issues identified. Provides clear detail and rationale to mitigate issues identified. | 1 point  Little 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 points  No description or discussion of high level plans that mitigate all technology issues identified. No detail or rationale to mitigate issues identified. | | Next Steps | 5 points  Clearly describes next steps that must be taken to resolve all issues identified. | 4 points  Basically describes next steps that must be taken to resolve all issues identified. | 2 points  Weakly describes next steps that must be taken to resolve all issues identified. | 1 point  Little description of next steps that may be taken to resolve some issues identified. (Or, inappropriate or excessive copying from other authors' work.) | 0 points  Doesn’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 points  Used at least 5 authoritative or scholarly sources in paper. No APA style errors in sources. | 4 points  Used at least 3 authoritative or scholarly sources in paper. No more than 1 APA errors in sources. | 3 points  Used at least 2 authoritative or scholarly sources in paper. No more than 2 APA errors in sources. | 1 point  May have used 1 authoritative or scholarly source in paper. May not have used APA style formatting. | 0 points  No authoritative or scholarly sources used in paper. | | Citation of Sources | 5 points  All sources cited. No errors in citing material in paper. | 4 points  All but 1 source cited. Had no more than 5 citing errors in paper. | 2 points  All but 2 sources cited. Had no more than 10 citing errors in paper. | 1 point  All but 3 sources cited. Had less than 15 APA citing errors in paper. | 0 points  No 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 points  Prepared 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 points  MS 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 points  MS 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 point  MS 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 points  Non 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 points  No grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors. | 4 points  Less than 5 grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors. | 2 points  Less than 10 grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors. | 1 point  Less than 15 grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors. | 0 points  More than 15 grammar errors, use of first/second person, spelling or punctuation errors. | | **Overall Score** | **Level 5 4 or more** | **Level 4 3 or more** | **Level 3 2 or more** | **Level 2 1 or more** | **Level 1 0 or more** | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |