

## The Process of Financial Planning and The Case Approach to Financial Planning Textbooks/Capstone/Case-Based Financial Plan Development Course/Sample Grading Rubric

### Final Project Grading Rubric

Page 1 of 2

<i>Attribute</i>	<i>Very Deficient</i>	<i>Somewhat Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Outstanding</i>
<i>Scores</i>	<i>0 to 3</i>	<i>4 to 5</i>	<i>6 to 7</i>	<i>8 to 9</i>	<i>10</i>
Data from the case narrative used properly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable, but disappointing (75<sup>th</sup> to 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of plans).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable (25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> of plans)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among 10<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among top 10% of plans.</li> <li>Plan illustrates student's ability to assess family needs.</li> </ul>
Overall quality of written plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable, but disappointing (75<sup>th</sup> to 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of plans).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable (25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> of plans)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among 10<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among top 10% of plans.</li> </ul>
Plan Creativity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used professional software or did not apply Excel and Word to the plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Original to some degree.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates originality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very original work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Original and creative.</li> <li>Plan shows integration of program content with effective planning skills</li> </ul>
Quality and presentation of writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires a professional editor.</li> <li>Sentence structure, language and style deficient.</li> <li>Major revisions required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writing is weak.</li> <li>A number of typos, grammatical and spelling errors.</li> <li>A number of changes required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable (25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> percentile).</li> <li>Limited number of typos (grammatical and spelling errors).</li> <li>Some normal changes necessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very well written.</li> <li>Easy to read and understand.</li> <li>Very few changes or additions required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reads like an outstanding financial plan.</li> <li>No typos, grammatical, or spelling errors.</li> <li>No revisions or changes; acceptable as is.</li> </ul>
Written plan narrative and format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very poorly organized.</li> <li>Disjointed presentation.</li> <li>Unable to answer a number of questions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not well organized.</li> <li>Rambled; dwelt too long on less important aspects.</li> <li>Had difficulty addressing client questions and goals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable – good overall presentation.</li> <li>Able to answer most client questions and goals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well thought out.</li> <li>Professional presentation.</li> <li>Almost all questions and addressed in a professional manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well organized and very professional.</li> <li>All questions and goals addressed in a knowledgeable and respectable manner.</li> </ul>
Competence in planning math and calculations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable, but disappointing (75<sup>th</sup> to 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of plans).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable (25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> of plans)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among 10<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among top 10% of plans.</li> <li>Synthesis of complex data shown</li> </ul>
Recommendation and Implementation strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barely acceptable, among the bottom 10% of plans.</li> <li>Strategies are not holistic showing changes in cash flow.</li> <li>Changes to other areas of the client's plan are not shown.</li> <li>Does not answer the what, why, when, how, where, and who questions.</li> <li>Recommendations are not actionable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable, but disappointing (75<sup>th</sup> to 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of plans).</li> <li>Strategies are not holistic showing changes in cash flow.</li> <li>Answers few of the what, why, when, how, where, and who questions.</li> <li>Client might be able to implement recommendations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable (25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> of plans)</li> <li>Answers some of the what, why, when, how, where, and who questions.</li> <li>Client probably could implement recommendations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among 10<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of plans</li> <li>Answers most of the what, why, when, how, where, and who questions.</li> <li>Client could implement recommendations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among top 10% of plans.</li> <li>Strategies are holistic showing changes in cash flow.</li> <li>Changes to other areas of the client's plan are clearly shown.</li> <li>Answers the what, why, when, how, where, and who questions.</li> <li>Client could easily implement recommendations.</li> </ul>

<b>Oral Communication:</b> Expressing ideals clearly when communicating orally				
<b>Levels of Achievement:</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Marginal</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
<b>Organization</b>	Presentation is clear, logical, and sequential. Listener can follow line of reasoning.	Presentation is generally clear and well organized. A few minor points may be confusing.	Listener can follow presentation with effort. Some arguments are not clear. Organization seems haphazard.	Logic of arguments is not made clear. Listeners are confused.
<b>Style</b>	Level of presentation is appropriate for the audience. Presentation is a planned conversation, paced for audience understanding. It is <i>not</i> a reading of a paper. Speaker is clearly comfortable in front of the group and can be heard by all.	Level of presentation is generally appropriate. Pacing is sometimes too fast or slow. The presenter seems slightly uncomfortable at times, and the audience occasionally has trouble hearing him or her.	Aspects of presentation are too elementary or too sophisticated for audience. Presenter seems uncomfortable and can be heard only if listener is very attentive. Much of the information is read.	Presentation consistently is too elementary or too sophisticated for the audience. Information is read to audience. Presenter is obviously anxious and cannot be heard.
<b>Use of Communication Aids (e.g., Transparencies, Slides, Posters, Handouts, Computer Generated Materials)</b>	Communication aids enhance the presentation. They are prepared in a professional manner. Font on visuals is large enough to be seen by all. Information is organized to maximize audience understanding. Details are minimized so that main points stand out.	Communication aids contribute to the quality of the presentation. Font size is appropriate for reading. Appropriate information is included. Some material is not supported by visual aids.	Communication aids are poorly prepared or used inappropriately. Font is too small to be easily seen. Too much information is included. Unimportant material is highlighted. Listeners may be confused.	No communication aids are used, or they are so poorly prepared that they detract from the presentation.
<b>Content: depth of content</b>	Speaker provides an accurate and complete explanation of key concepts and theories, drawing upon relevant literature. Applications of theory are included to illuminate issues. Listeners gain insights.	For the most part, explanations of concepts and theories are accurate and complete. Some helpful applications are included.	Explanations of concepts and/or theories are inaccurate or incomplete. Little attempt is made to tie theory to practice. Listeners gain little from the presentation.	No reference is made to literature or theory. Listeners gain no new insights.
<b>Content: accuracy of content</b>	Information (names, facts, etc.) included in the presentation is consistently accurate	No significant errors are made. Listeners recognize any errors to be the result of nervousness or oversight.	Enough errors are made to distract a knowledgeable listener, but some information is accurate. The presentation is useful if the listener can determine what information is reliable.	Information included is sufficiently inaccurate that the listener cannot depend on the presentation as a source of accurate information. Listeners may have been misled.
<b>Use of language: grammar and word choice</b>	Sentences are complete and grammatical, and they flow together easily. Words are chosen for their precise meaning.	For the most part, sentences are complete and grammatical, and they flow together easily. With a few exceptions, words are chosen for their precise meaning.	Listeners can follow the presentation, but some grammatical errors and use of slang are evident. Some sentences are incomplete/halting, and/or vocabulary is somewhat limited or inappropriate.	Listeners are so distracted by the presenter's apparent difficulty with grammar and appropriate vocabulary that they cannot focus on the ideas presented.
<b>Use of language: freedom from bias (e.g., sexism, racism, ageism, heterosexism, etc.)</b>	Both oral language and body language are free from bias.	Oral language and body language are free from bias with one or two minor exceptions.	Oral language and/or body language includes some significant bias. Listeners may be offended.	Oral language and/or body language frequently reflects bias. Some, if not all, listeners will probably be offended.
<b>Personal Appearance</b>	Personal appearance is completely appropriate for the occasion and the audience.	For the most part, personal appearance is appropriate for the occasion and the audience.	Personal appearance is somewhat inappropriate for the occasion and audience.	Personal appearance is inappropriate for the occasion and audience.
<b>Responsiveness to audience: verbal interaction</b>	Highly responsive to audience comments and needs. Consistently clarifies, restates, and responds to questions. Summarizes when needed.	Generally responsive to audience comments and needs. Most of the time, clarifies, restates, responds to questions, and summarizes when needed. Misses some opportunities for interaction.	Reluctantly interacts with audience. Responds to questions inadequately.	Avoids or discourages active audience participation. Is not responsive to group.
<b>Responsiveness to audience: body language</b>	Body language reflects confidence and ease when interacting with audience.	Body language reflects comfort when interacting with audience.	Body language reflects some discomfort when interacting with audience.	Body language reveals a reluctance to interact with audience.

Note: This Grading Rubric has been used in a Capstone/Case-Based Financial Plan course in conjunction with the textbooks: *The Process of Financial Planning: Developing a Financial Plan* and *The Case Approach to Financial Planning: Writing a Financial Plan* written by Ruth L. Lytton, John E. Grable, and Derek D. Klock. It is provided for informational purposes only and does not imply approval of or acceptance by any other entity. ©J.Grable 2009. All rights reserved. Not for distribution without prior permission from The National Underwriter Company. For additional information, visit [www.nucollege.com](http://www.nucollege.com) or contact [klove@sbmedia.com](mailto:klove@sbmedia.com).