**SOWK 718: Case Analysis Assessment Checklist**

| **Criteria** | **Poor/****Not met** | **Fair/****Partially met** | **Good/****Partially met** | **Better/****Partially met** | **Best/****Fully met** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I. Introduction.** A well-written introduction succinctly identifies the setting, key people, and current situation. The introduction: |
| *Is succinct* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Identifies the setting* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Identifies key people* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Summarizes the current situation* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **II. Problem Formulation.** To set the stage for action, a strong problem formulation *explains* what causes the problem in a concise, thoughtful, critical, and useful way. The problem formulation: |
| *Includes essential elements of the case:* |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Incorporates attention to the presenting problem, why this was a problem, and the need to act.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Asserts explanatory relationships between elements in the simplest, appropriate way.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Clarifies why deciding and/or acting was difficult for the protagonist (i.e., decision maker) in the situation.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Impartial to strategies (i.e., it does not presume a strategy)*  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Frames the problem in a way amenable to intervention by the protagonist (i.e., decision-maker) at the time.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **III. Contextual Analysis.** A strong, comprehensive contextual analysis provides an argument *explaining* how essential elements relate, and *justifying* the problem formulation. The contextual analysis: |
| *Is factually correct.*  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Explains how and why the facts of the case matter.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Attends to multiple system levels (e.g., micro, meso, macro) and integrates thinking across those levels.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Uses topic sentences that make a clear and sequential argument.*  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Provides support for each part of the argument using analysis of case data, relevant theory, practice/empirical knowledge, and/or ethics.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Attends fairly to strengths and weaknesses of the argument.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Offers a compelling argument.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **IV. Alternative Strategies.** After identifying a successful outcome,a strong set of alternative strategies will represent plausible options for responding to the presenting problem and underlying issues.  |
| *Identifies what a successful outcome requires.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| As a group, the strategies: |
| *Address the presenting problem as well as underlying causes.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Are unique and distinct from each other.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Are something the protagonist (i.e., decision-maker) can do or facilitate at the time.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion of each strategy (distinguished by strategy number 1, 2, and 3 below): |
| *Responds to all essential elements of the problem formulation.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Considers relevant ethical principles and legal and policy contexts, as appropriate.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Considers unintended consequences, as appropriate.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Considers why the problem is difficult for the protagonist at this time.*  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  *Considers strengths of the strategy.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Considers limitations of the strategy.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Provides adequate detail for understanding what the strategy entails.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **V. Recommendation and Rationale.** A strong, complete recommendation provides a rationale for choosing one strategy over the others presented. The recommendation and rationale: |
| *Gives explicit reason(s) for choosing this strategy over the alternatives.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Is logically coherent.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Makes claims grounded in evidence (e.g., NASW Code of Ethics, empirical literature, theoretical frameworks, professional experience).*  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Identifies the primary source of the student’s thinking about this case (e.g., experience, intuition, values, beliefs, theories, authority, empirical research, previous discussions, or something else).* | No | Yes |
| **VI. Writing.** Well written papers will communicate clearly, persuasively, and without distractions, and will appear professional quality. Strong writing is: |
| *Concise, efficient, and appropriate length.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Respectful (e.g., person-first, non-sexist).* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *In mostly active voice.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Well organized (e.g., sentence, paragraph, section).* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Uses proper grammar, spelling and punctuation.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Includes proper APA-style in-text citations and references, as needed.* |  |  |  |  |  |