

Case Study Evaluation Rubric

GC Academy Limited | BA in Media and Communication | MQF Level 6

Purpose and approved use

This rubric evaluates written case studies against the approved module brief. It assesses understanding of a media or communication case, theoretical application, critical judgement and evidence-based recommendations. Students use it to understand expectations; assessors use it to explain marks against the required individual performance.

Revision prepared 9 September 2026 | Institutional approval pending

Owner: Head of Institution. QA coordination: Head of Quality Assurance Office. Academic provisions are reviewed by the QA and Curriculum Committee and approved by the Academic Board under A17 and A18. Approval reference and effective date: _____.

The six criteria and their 20 / 20 / 25 / 15 / 10 / 10 weights follow Part B of the submitted June Assessment Rubrics for Assignments and Case Studies. The approved module brief identifies the controlling version and the case component to which it applies. Earlier conflicting schemes are reconciled before release.

Assessment identification

Module title and code	_____	Student name or ID	_____
Case title and brief version	_____	Assessor	_____
Assessment component and module weight	_____	Attempt number	1 Initial / 2 Resit / 3 Resit
Case type and source reference	Real / Constructed / Simulated Source: _____	Format limit and deadline	_____
Rubric version and release date	_____	Second academic design review	Name and date: _____
Head of Institution approval reference	_____	Approved adjustment reference	Restricted record / None: _____

Before the task is released

The educator completes the outcome mapping and checks the task against Section D11. The brief identifies the scenario, sources, context, required analysis and outputs, with sufficient information for independent judgement. It states assumptions, permitted data access and any ethical or confidentiality requirements. A suitably qualified second academic reviews the design wherever possible.

The Head of Institution records approval within the approved specification; material changes follow Academic Board approval. New task details in the September 2026 programme revision require approval before use. Before undertaking the task, students receive the brief and rubric, including output limits, component weight, deadline, permitted AI assistance, individual or group format, support, reassessment and appeals. No universal word limit or new component weight is imposed.

Case Study Evaluation Rubric

GC Academy Limited | BA in Media and Communication | MQF Level 6

Rubric criteria 1 to 3

Rate each criterion from 0 to 100, then calculate weighted points. Bands: Excellent 85 to 100; Very good 70 to below 85; Good 60 to below 70; Pass 51 to below 60; Fail below 51. Record the evidence and reasons. Both rubric pages form one scheme.

Criterion	Weight	Direct evidence to assess	Performance descriptors	Score
1 Understanding of the case and identification of key issues	20%	Accurate interpretation of the case, context and stakeholders. Identify the central issues and distinguish facts from assumptions. Select relevant information rather than repeat the narrative.	Excellent: Precise, insightful understanding; all major issues clearly identified. Very good: Strong understanding; most key issues identified accurately. Good: Sound understanding; some issues simplified or overlooked. Pass: Essential case understood; principal issues adequately identified. Fail: Case misunderstood or relevant issues largely unidentified.	___ % ___ /20
2 Application of relevant theory, concepts or frameworks	20%	Select and apply appropriate media or communication theory to explain the case. Connect concepts to specific facts and decisions; justify their relevance and recognise limits.	Excellent: Theory integrated effectively and insightfully into the case analysis. Very good: Relevant theory applied clearly and appropriately. Good: Some relevant concepts applied; connections are uneven. Pass: Basic but meaningful theoretical application to the case. Fail: No meaningful application, or theory is used inaccurately.	___ % ___ /20
3 Depth of analysis and critical judgement	25%	Analyse causes, consequences and alternatives. Evaluate evidence, assumptions and limitations; justify independent conclusions. Address relevant ethical and professional considerations.	Excellent: Deep, balanced analysis with strong independent professional judgement. Very good: Clear critical analysis and sound, supported judgement. Good: Adequate analysis; depth or evaluation is uneven. Pass: Basic but sufficient analysis and a defensible conclusion. Fail: Mostly description or unsupported claims; meaningful analysis absent.	___ % ___ /25

Integrity concerns follow A4 and the existing AI and Generative AI Guidance for Staff and Students. Assessors record the quality of the submitted evidence under the relevant criteria; a detection flag is not a finding of misconduct or an automatic mark penalty.

The 12-ECTS Final Project has a combined case study with presentation assessment worth 100%. Its approved brief and adapted rubrics cover research, methodology, the project record and oral defence under A18. These six criteria alone do not define the full capstone standard or create a separate 60/40 allocation. External review follows A18.

Case Study Evaluation Rubric

GC Academy Limited | BA in Media and Communication | MQF Level 6

Rubric criteria 4 to 6

Rate each criterion from 0 to 100, then calculate weighted points. Bands: Excellent 85 to 100; Very good 70 to below 85; Good 60 to below 70; Pass 51 to below 60; Fail below 51. Record the evidence and reasons. Both rubric pages form one scheme.

Criterion	Weight	Direct evidence to assess	Performance descriptors	Score
4 Quality of proposed solutions	15%	Propose feasible responses grounded in the analysis. Explain priorities, practical implications, risks and limitations relevant to the case. Justify why the response is appropriate.	Excellent: Realistic, well-justified recommendations tightly linked to the analysis. Very good: Relevant recommendations, mostly supported by the analysis. Good: Generally appropriate solutions; some are broad or underdeveloped. Pass: Basic, feasible response with a sufficient link to the analysis. Fail: Recommendations missing, unrealistic or unsupported.	___ % ___ /15
5 Use of sources and evidence	10%	Use credible case evidence and relevant academic or professional sources. Distinguish source material from personal inference; acknowledge and reference it accurately. Quality matters more than source count.	Excellent: Strong, relevant evidence and sources; accurate attribution. Very good: Relevant sources support the work; references mostly accurate. Good: Some appropriate sources; range or integration is limited. Pass: Essential claims supported by traceable evidence; referencing uneven. Fail: Evidence absent, inappropriate, insufficient or unacknowledged.	___ % ___ /10
6 Structure, writing quality and presentation	10%	Organise the written case study coherently. Communicate the analysis and recommendations clearly, with appropriate terminology, language and formatting. Apply the approved output requirements and adjustments.	Excellent: Clear, professional structure and consistently accurate writing. Very good: Well organised and clearly written; minor errors. Good: Generally clear; some organisational or writing weaknesses. Pass: Basic structure; meaning understandable despite recurring errors. Fail: Poor organisation or expression materially obscures meaning.	___ % ___ /10

Weighted points = criterion rating x criterion weight / 100. Total the six weighted points to obtain the case-study mark out of 100. Example of calculation only: a rating of 80 for a 25% criterion contributes 20 points. Record any authorised rounding rule; this rubric introduces no compensation or mark cap.

The pass requirement is 51% for each assessment component, not 51% in every rubric criterion. The brief retains the approved component weights. For the Strategic Communication case component worth 60%, a case mark of 70 contributes 42 module points; its 40% presentation component must also be passed.

Case Study Evaluation Rubric

GC Academy Limited | BA in Media and Communication | MQF Level 6

Learning outcome evidence and assessment result

Complete the first three columns before release and the final column during marking. Copy the exact relevant module outcome codes and wording from Section D3, and identify the contributing programme outcomes from B20 and D11. Add rows as needed. Assess only the outcomes assigned to this task.

Module outcome and contributing PLO	Task part and required individual evidence	Rubric criterion and expected standard	Work reference and attainment judgement with reason

Map case understanding and theory through criteria 1 and 2; analysis through 3; applied recommendations through 4; evidence through 5; written communication through 6. The actual mapping is task-specific. Where reflection or digital skills are assigned, identify attributable evidence. Written work alone does not demonstrate oral or group performance. Explain criterion boundaries to avoid penalising the same weakness twice.

Record “Achieved”, “Partly demonstrated” or “Not demonstrated” with the evidence and reason against the approved outcome standard. The overall mark is not automatic proof that every outcome or PLO is achieved. An outcome gap is referred for academic review under A18; the rubric creates no additional numerical outcome threshold.

Initial total	___ /100	Component pass requirement	51%
Second marker total	___ /100	Agreed moderated total	___ /100
Board of Examiners validated result	___ /100 Pass / Fail	Validation date and reference	_____
Status at feedback release	Provisional / Validated / Case pending	Remaining formal attempts	___ of three total
Reassessment or approved deferral	Decision / date / reference: _____	Authorised rounding or amendment	Rule / authority / calculation: _____

Criterion comments and supporting work references are retained with this record. LMS logs, time online, attendance and student confidence are contextual or indirect evidence; assess the student’s actual work and performance to judge attainment.

Case Study Evaluation Rubric

GC Academy Limited | BA in Media and Communication | MQF Level 6

Feedback, moderation and record completion

Feedback is provided within 10 working days of submission under A18. It explains strengths, outcome-specific gaps and practical next steps. Clearly identify a provisional result. The Head of Institution monitors delays, arranges cover or corrective action, and ensures that the student receives an explanation and revised feedback date.

Feedback area	Assessor comments linked to criteria and work
Strengths and evidence	
Analysis, recommendations and outcome gaps	
Feedforward and reassessment guidance where applicable	

Final summative work receives second marking and moderation by a suitably qualified academic other than the first marker. Retain both judgements and the evidence-based resolution of differences. Unresolved differences go to an additional unconflicted academic designated by the Head of Institution and then to the Board of Examiners for validation. Declare conflicts before accepting the role.

A case study remains individual unless a group format is academically approved. For approved group work, identify each student's attributable output, contribution, reflection or questioning and the marking approach. Peer ratings, activity counts or a common product alone do not establish individual attainment. A separately assessed presentation or practical output uses its own approved criteria and component weight.

Apply approved adjustments without changing assessed outcomes. Technical disruption and mitigating circumstances follow the published process. Reassessment uses equivalent outcomes and standards within the three total formal opportunities; formative practice is excluded and return to study does not reset attempts. Integrity findings and appeals follow the independent routes in A4, A16 and A17.

Record or responsibility	Name, date and evidence reference
First marker and feedback release	
Independent second marker and moderation outcome	
Unresolved difference or case referral if applicable	
Board of Examiners validation and student notification	

Retain the brief, rubric, outcome mapping, individual work, marks and amendment history, feedback, moderation, attempts, case decisions and validation securely under A25. Module review analyses criterion and outcome findings; actions and their effectiveness are followed through A18 and the Quality Enhancement Log. Record completed evidence when assessment takes place.