



**Dear Make the Case East Asia Case Study Reviewers,**

Thank you for your participation in judging the Case Studies (Step 3) from student teams from East Asian Universities. Each team will have 3 Reviewer scorecards completed. We will add these 3 scores (a total of potential 70 points per judge) and come up with an average score for each team. This score will account for 87.5% of their total score, with the other 12.5% from their Plastic Atlas Asia Insights submission (Step 3) that is separately scored.

The top 8 teams (top 4 from each of the two themes) will compete this Fall where the student teams will make presentations –and their (average) presentation scores (up to 20 points) will be added to their previous score (Case Study/Plastic Atlas Asia Insights) to crown the winning teams, and runner ups.

The two themes basically have the same template. Theme 1 **focuses on initiatives directly impacting plastic waste entering the water.** Theme 2 **focuses on initiatives on land that impact plastic waste collection and limiting plastic waste in the first place.** Reading the two web pages for each Theme will give you a very good idea of the types of initiatives we were hoping they'd find:

- Theme 1: <https://makethecase.capp.global/east-asia-theme-one/>
- Theme 2: <https://makethecase.capp.global/east-asia-theme-two/>
- Case Study Template Sample: <https://makethecase.capp.global/make-the-case-case-study-east-asia-template-theme1.pdf>

**THE CASE STUDY**

The design of the case study was to get the teams to think what's possible. First, on Page 1 we ask them to create basically an executive summary stating the problem and their solution. Note, each answer has a limit of words. We aren't going to penalize the students for being over the word limit. Part I allows them to provide background. Part 2 the initiative's impact. Part III provides a "what if" scenario where the team is asked to "make the case" as if they are requesting additional money/resources for the current initiative and expected benefits/outcomes for using the money. Part IV asks the team to "make the case" for replicating the initiative to other similar stakeholders in East Asia and also the world. In many ways, if they interviewed the stakeholder, these answers should be fairly robust, and hopefully, illuminating as to what can be improved on, replicated and then scaled.

**JUDGING INSTRUCTIONS:**

As you review the scorecard, please note that it mimics these different parts. You may want to read each section and then answer the questions on your scorecard. The last section is about the overall presentation. .

There are 6 overall questions to score. Each question provides a Point Guide to create some uniformity in our scoring among the many reviewers. For example, Question 6 is worth 10 points of the 70 points. The Point Guide provides a **relative scale**. Thus, if you think the team's answer is "Exceptional" you could award 10 points, but you can also award 9 or 8 if you felt is worth more than the 7 point reference of "clear and concise."

Please write or type your answers for each team you're reviewing below. Once you have completed all your team reviews, if you write your answers, please scan and send as a PDF. If you type, please save file as a PDF. Please send to me at [Rob@capp.global](mailto:Rob@capp.global)

**AFTER COMPLETING YOUR SCORECARD FOR YOUR ASSIGNED TEAM:**

Lastly, please add the Team Name and your name on each Scorecard Page, and please add up your scores for each Part and enter them for each team's review appropriately, as well as sum up the total. We'd appreciate the assistance. Here's what it should look like.

**Summary Information**

TEAM NAME:	Team XYZ	SCORE:	Q1: <input type="text" value="12"/> of 17 pts	Q3: <input type="text" value="8"/> of 12 pts.	Q5: <input type="text" value="14"/> of 18 pts	TOTAL: <input type="text" value="61"/> of 70
JUDGE NAME:	Rob Steir		Q2: <input type="text" value="7"/> of 8 pts.	Q4: <input type="text" value="15"/> of 18 pts	Q6: <input type="text" value="3"/> of 3 pts	

**DUE DATE: Please complete your reviews no later July 31st. Thank you! If you have questions, please send to [Rob@capp.global](mailto:Rob@capp.global) - PLEASE SEND BACK ALL RESPONSES TO: [ROB@CAPP.GLOBAL](mailto:ROB@CAPP.GLOBAL)**

# THE MAKE THE CASE EAST-ASIA REVIEWER SCORECARD

TEAM NAME:	SCORE: Q1: <input style="width: 20px;" type="text"/> of 17 pts	Q3: <input style="width: 20px;" type="text"/> of 12 pts.	Q5: <input style="width: 20px;" type="text"/> of 12 pts	TOTAL: <input style="width: 40px;" type="text"/> of 70
JUDGE NAME:	Q2: <input style="width: 20px;" type="text"/> of 8 pts.	Q4: <input style="width: 20px;" type="text"/> of 18 pts	Q6: <input style="width: 20px;" type="text"/> of 3 pts	

## Q1 FIRST PAGE AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<b>17 Points</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Point Guide</b>	<b>Score</b>
(1) Did the team paint a good picture of what the initiative is all about, is accomplishing, or has accomplished” (First Page and Background). Did the team define the specific problem the initiative addresses, and provide a good understanding of the problem and why it needs to be solved?	<b>17</b>	Yes, exceptionally well: 14-17 points Yes, clearly and concisely: 8-13 points So, So: 1-7 points Not at all: 0 points	

## Q2 IMPACT

<b>8 Points</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Point Guide</b>	<b>Score</b>
(2) Did the team write a compelling “case” for the 3 (environmental, social, economic) benefits of the initiative?	<b>8</b>	Yes, exceptionally well: 6-8 points Yes, clearly and concisely: 4-5 points So, So: 1-3 points Not at all: 0 points	

## Q3 MAKE THE CASE FOR MORE RESOURCES/BENEFITS OF INITIATIVE

<b>12 Points</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Point Guide</b>	<b>Score</b>
(3) Based on the information presented, did the team “make the case” for the incremental costs of adding more resources (line items) and projected benefits that would result? Another factor in your scoring this question: if you had the power to approve or not approve the additional funding request, would you have approved it based on what was presented?	<b>12</b>	Yes, exceptionally well: 10-12 points Yes, clearly and concisely: 5-9 points So, So: 1-4 points Not at all: 0 points	

## Q4 MAKE THE CASE FOR REPLICATING IN EAST ASIA AND ELSEWHERE

<b>18 Points</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Point Guide</b>	<b>Score</b>
(4) Did the team “make the case” why their initiative should be replicated? Was their reasoning well thought out? Did they showcase both positive and negative issues?	<b>18</b>	Yes, exceptionally well: 11-18 points Yes, clearly and concisely: 6-10 points So, So: 1-5 points Not at all: 0 points	

## Q5 AND Q6: ATTENTION TO DETAIL AND OVERALL “MAKE THE CASE” PRESENTATION

<b>15 Points</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Point Guide</b>	<b>Score</b>
(5) Did the team exhibit considerable thought, depth and effort in all of their answers. Did the student team “make the case” for their initiative	<b>12</b>	Yes, absolutely evident: 10-12 points Yes, put in the effort: 6-9 points So, So: 1-5 point Could have been much better: 0 points	
(6) Bonus points if the team documented who they interviewed, and displayed general thoroughness of completing the template. Were there any spelling errors or other format issues that would indicate a lack of attention to detail?	<b>3</b>	Well put together: 2-3 points Could have been done better: 1 point Too many errors: 0 points	