

Section	Focus Area	Exemplary [100% - 90%]	Accomplished (90% - 70%)	Developing (70% - 50%)	Beginning (<50%)
Holistic Guide	Audience	Every section of the report is consistently written for a specific appropriate audience with the information conveyed being appropriately presented to the target audience	The report is consistent in target audience it has been written for	The report is sometimes inconsistent or confusing in which audience it seems to be written for	The report is frequently inconsistent or confusing in what audience it seems to be written for or appears to be written for the assignment markers rather than an appropriate target audience
	Intention	The report has a clear purpose or intention, the significance & relevance highlighted to the target audience	The purpose or intention of the report is understandable with most of the significance conveyed	The message of the report is mostly understandable; however, the intent of some sections is confusing to their relevance to the report	The report has no clear message
	Message	The report delivers a clear & actionable message to the reader	The message in the report is clear & can be understood with minimal effort	The message in the report can be understood with some effort by the reader	The report has no clear message or requires effort by the reader to understand the message
	Explanation	The purpose and message are effectively supported throughout the report with relevant, concise, well-structured information	The purpose and message are well supported by evidence throughout the report using well-structured information	The information in the report mostly supports the purpose and message, the structure of the report makes the information conveyed somewhat clear	The information in the report is not relevant or is poorly structured resulting in a confusing and difficult to understand report

Reporting (10%)	Flow	The narrative flows well from one section to the other forming a clear narrative picture for the reader; each section has its own relevant introduction	The narrative flows well from one section to the other; each section has its own introduction	There is some flow between the sections, but this is not consistent; transitions between sections are a bit jarring	Each section of the report seems to be written independently of the other sections, as if they were completed for an assignment – there is no flow
	Readability	Organized into logical sentences, paragraphs, & sections; easy to read	The organisation of the report is rarely confusing; mostly easy to read	The organisation of the report is mostly clear and easy to read, with only some areas of confusion.	The report is poorly organised throughout and it is very difficult to read
	Spelling and grammar	Minimal spelling and grammatical errors that do not impact readability	Very few cases of spelling and grammatical errors with little to no impact on readability	Some spelling and grammatical errors with a small impact on readability	Many spelling and grammatical errors that affect the readability and understanding of the report
	Formatting	Clear formatting and use of figure/table captions	Clear formatting and use of figure/table captions. Limited minor errors or inconsistencies	Formatting is not tidy in places and use of captions can be improved	Formatting is poor throughout the report and figures/tables lack captions
	Referencing	Proper referencing APA 7 th edition; report has appropriate references	Proper referencing APA 7 th edition; report has a missing reference or irrelevant references	Referencing system other than APA 7 th edition; references are missing in places and sometimes are not relevant	Referencing system is confusing; references are missing throughout the report or are not relevant

Executive summary (15%)	Summary	Essential information from the report is summarised and concise; only relevant information to the audience presented	Essential information from the report is summarised. Information presented is mostly relevant to audience	Some essential information from the report is missing or the information presented is not entirely relevant	Most essential information from the report is missing or the information provided is not clear in relevance
	Recommendations	Clear recommendations of the preferred way forward with key supporting evidence	Recommendations are stated, relevant important details of recommendations not entirely clear	Recommendations are not clearly stated or can be deduced; relevant important details of recommendations unclear	No recommendations are given or very difficult to deduce
	Stand alone	The section is stand alone and leaves the reader with a strong impression; provides a reader with sufficient context and information to make a decision without reading the body of the report in detail	The section provides a strong idea of what the report is proposing with reasonable context and information to almost make a decision. Reader may need to read a minor section of the report in greater detail for more context	The section provides an idea of what the report is proposing but the reader needs to get some more information from some sections of the report to make a decision	The reader needs to read the whole report to be able to make a decision and they would not know what the report is proposing from reading this section
Strategic Case (25%)	Project Background	Clearly states the purpose of this business case; concise and relevant background & context that is relevant to the problem is presented	The purpose of this business case could be more specifically stated; reasonable and sufficiently relevant background & context necessary to understand the problem is provided	The purpose of this business case can be deduced, but is not entirely clear; relevant background and context necessary to understand the problem is somewhat provided, but is lacking	The purpose of this business case is not presented; relevant background & context necessary to understand problem is missing

	Problem statement	At least two clear specific problem statements are identified; provides a clear narrative of how the problem evolved from a broad conception to the specific statements; example of systems thinking tool, provided in the appendix, clearly explores the problem space to understand the problem	At least two reasonably specific problem statements are identified from problem spaces, with a somewhat clear narrative of how the problem evolved from problem space to problem statement; example of systems thinking tool, provided in the appendix, is used to explore the problem space to understand the problem	The problems are somewhat broad; or only one problem statement is included; gives some idea of how the problem evolved from problem space to problem statement; example of systems thinking tool, provided in the appendix, is poorly used to explore the problem space and understand the problem	The problem statements are very broad or still stuck at the problem space stage; there is no problem evolution or evidence of problem analysis, there is no example of systems thinking tools in the appendix
	Stakeholders	Clear identification of stakeholders, stakeholder analysis is clearly shown with depth for key stakeholders and identified the key stakeholders for the project; briefly identifies engagement strategies that strongly align for the key stakeholders	Stakeholders identified; most stakeholders mentioned; stakeholder analysis and reasoning is covered but could be communicated more clearly or with more depth for key stakeholders; engagement strategy is mentioned but not strongly aligned with the stakeholder analysis	Stakeholders broadly identified; a key stakeholder may be missing or misidentified as non-key. Stakeholder analysis and reasoning is underdeveloped and missing depth of analysis for key stakeholders Engagement methods are mostly aligned with the analysis presented	Stakeholders are not specified or not mentioned; stakeholder analysis is missing or poorly communicated; engagement methods are missing or unaligned with the analysis presented.

	Requirements	Identifies appropriate requirements and their importance; provides evidence of how the requirements were selected. Requirements table clearly conveys requirements of key stakeholders.	Requirements are identified, a requirement may be poorly described or justified, but the majority of requirements are well described and justified; reasonable evidence is provided of how the requirements were selected. Requirements table conveys requirements of key stakeholders, a necessary requirement may be mislabelled or missing.	Requirements are mostly identified; a couple may be missing; some description of their importance; some evidence of how the requirements were selected. Requirements table mostly conveys requirements of key stakeholders. Some necessary requirements may be mislabelled or missing.	Requirements are poorly described or missing; no classification is provided regarding their importance; no evidence is provided of how they were selected. Requirements table missing or very confusing.
	Key Success Factors	Selects appropriate 4-6 key success factors from the requirements.	Selects 4-6 key success factors from requirements, one may not be appropriate or does not come from the requirements.	Selects 4-6 key success factors but they are not all appropriate or do not come from the requirements.	Key success factors are not relevant, do not come from the requirements, or are completely missing
	Constraints and Assumptions	Constraints and starting assumptions are identified, real, valid for the problem, constraints and assumptions that require further details are explained	Constraints and starting assumptions are generally identified and connect with the problem, some assumptions or constraints that are not clear lack further explanation	Constraints and starting assumptions are stated and somewhat connect with the problem, a few less important assumptions may be missing, some assumptions or constraints that are not clear lack further explanation	Constraints and starting assumptions are missing or not connected to the problem

Economic Case (15%)	Long-list options assessment	Identifies appropriate longlist options which are relevant potential solutions to the problem being addressed.	Most longlist options are relevant potential solutions to the problem being addressed.	Some of the options from the longlist are not relevant for the problem being addressed.	Most of the options from the longlist are not relevant for the problem being addressed.
	KSF Assessment	Relevant criteria using the key success factors to carry out options assessment. Clearly discusses the reasoning behind eliminated options and any discounted options being carried forward with clear justification.	Criteria and key success factors are used to carry out the options assessment, one of the criteria may not be unclear with why they were chosen or relevant. Discusses the reasoning behind eliminated options and any discounted options being carried forward with some justification	Criteria are mostly relevant, with some criteria unclear with why they were chosen or relevant, and some of the key success factors are not used in the options assessment. Provides some reason why a discounted option is carried forward but is not well justified.	The criteria used is not relevant or the key success factors are not used for the initial options assessment. Carries forward a discounted option without discussion or is poorly discussed.

	DFV Assessment	Each non-eliminated longlisted option is discussed with clarity using the DFV framework and the extent each option is desirable, feasible, and viable; the discussion is also well supported and justified. A reasonable and supported high-level cost estimate is included in the viability discussion of the options	Each non-eliminated longlisted option is discussed using the DFV framework and the extent each option is desirable, feasible, and viable. Some nuanced aspects of this discussion may be missing, but the discussion has good support and justification. A somewhat reasonable high-level cost estimate is included in the viability discussion of the options with some support	Each non-eliminated longlisted option is discussed using the DFV framework and the extent each option is desirable, feasible, and viable. However, discussion is limited, confusing, or has little support or justification. A high-level cost estimate is included in discussion but is poorly supported	DFV framework is not applied to the non-eliminated longlisted option, or the discussion is extremely confusing or missing. High-level cost estimate is missing or irrelevant to the longlist options
	Shortlist	Clearly communicates the logic for the selection of the shortlisted options with compelling justification. The reader is left with a strong impression that the short-listed options are well thought out with compelling reasoning.	The logic behind the selection of the shortlisted options is communicated well, some nuanced discussion may be missing but the justification is reasonably strong. The short-listed options are well thought out and explained.	The logic behind the selection of the shortlisted options is somewhat explained. The options are not well described.	The logic to select the shortlisted options is confusing or missing.

Financial Case (15%)	High-level CBA	Demonstrates a strong understanding of how to use a cost-benefit analysis, with a strong understanding of how to analyse the results to assess the economic viability of implementing the short-listed options. The financial implications of the short-listed options have been well considered and are compelling to the audience. Numbers presented are high-level and reasonable	Demonstrates a good understanding of how to use a cost-benefit analysis, with a good understanding of how to analyse the results to assess the economic viability of implementing the short-listed options. The financial implications of the short-listed options have been considered, but some nuanced aspects may be missing, or the justification may not be entirely sound. Numbers presented are high-level and reasonable	Shows some understanding of how to use a cost-benefit analysis, with some understanding of how to analyse the results to assess the economic viability of implementing the short-listed options. Some financial implications of the short-listed options have been considered, but may be confusing, not clear on relevance, or poorly explained and justified. Numbers presented are high-level and somewhat reasonable	Shows little to no understanding of how to use a cost-benefit analysis and analyse the results to assess the economic viability of implementing the short-listed options. The financial implications of the short-listed options are missing, confusing, or irrelevant. Numbers presented are unreasonable or confusing
	Benefits and Societal Considerations	Demonstrated a strong understanding of the societal costs and benefits for the proposed short-listed options with strong justification. Relevant frameworks from class have been used effectively leaving a strong impression on the reader	The societal costs and benefits for the short-listed options have been discussed well, but the justification feels incomplete. Relevant frameworks from class have been used effectively with good reasoning	Some societal costs and benefits for the short-listed options have been discussed, but the discussion was limited or not relevant, some obvious costs or benefits may be missing or vague. Relevant frameworks from class have been attempted to be used effectively, but the discussion is shallow or limited.	Societal costs and benefits for the short-listed options are poorly discussed or missing. Little to no references to the relevant frameworks from class have been used, or they have been used poorly and not as the framework intends

Management Case (5%)	Preferred way forward	A preferred option is clearly identified, with strong justification from the previous analysis; relevant information is presented clearly and concisely for the reader; clear discussion on how the preferred way forward aligns with current governmental plans. Leaves a strong impression on the reader of how the preferred option has been chosen and is the most reasonable course of action given the context	A preferred way forward is identified with good justification from the previous analysis; relevant information is presented to justify the preferred way forward clearly for the reader. Discussion on the alignment of the preferred way forward and the current governmental plans are considered and mostly relevant	A preferred way forward is somewhat identified, with some justification from the previous analysis; some relevant information is presented to justify the preferred way forward but is limited in how it supports; some discussion on the alignment of the preferred way forward and the current governmental plans are considered, but may be limited or not relevant	A preferred way forward is poorly identified or missing; justification from the previous analysis is poor or missing; relevant information for the justification is mostly missing or difficult to understand; weak discussion to no discussion on the alignment of the preferred way forward and the current governmental plans.
	High-level Implementation Plan and Timing	Clearly and concisely identifies the major implementation milestones and timing of delivery. Estimated timeframes are reasonable and realistic.	The major milestones and timing of delivery have been identified. Estimated timeframes are mostly reasonable and realistic	Identifies most major milestones and timing of delivery. Estimated timeframes seem somewhat reasonable and well-reasoned or can be deduced from the text.	Major milestones are missing or not clearly identified. Timing of the milestone delivery is not presented or not realistic.
	Expected Outcomes and Measures of Success	Expected outcomes and measures of success are presented clearly; outcomes are clear and measurable.	The expected outcomes and measures of success are presented well, but an indicator may be unclear in how it would be measured	The expected outcomes and measures of success are presented somewhat well, but may be a bit vague or difficult to understand how to measure the indicators	Expected outcomes and measure of success are missing or presented unclearly

	Funding	Clearly identifies and provides good justification on how the preferred way forward would be funded. Identifies which funded programs need to be scaled back; considers implications of new borrowings on GDP and government budgeting, leaving the reader with a strong impression of how the preferred way forward will be funded.	Identifies how the preferred way forward may be funded with some justification. Identified some funded programs to be scaled back; considers the impact of new borrowings on GDP and government budgeting, but some of the explanation was limited or lacking depth	Indicates how the potential preferred way forward may be funded; unclear discussion if funded programs will be scaled back or how new borrowings will impact the GDP and government.	Funding sources are not easily identified or missing; minimal to no discussion on program scale back or the impact of new borrowings. Little or no discussion of the impact on GDP or other important metrics
Recommendations and Conclusions (10%)	Recommendation	Clear recommendation and justification, Addresses the considerations for the recommendation, relevant to what has been discussed throughout the report	The recommendation and justification is understandable and relates to what has been discussed throughout the report	Recommendation and justification is understandable with some effort, considerations can be deduced from the text	There is no clear recommendation and justification; considerations for recommendation is missing or confusing.
	Next steps	Next steps are clearly summarised, concise, reasonable, and relate to what was discussed	Next steps are well summarised, they are reasonable and relate to what was discussed	Next steps are somewhat summarised, some may be unreasonable or do not relate to what was discussed	Next steps are poorly summarised or missing or wildly unreasonable

Video (5%)	Key Points	Clearly conveys the key points of the report. Includes investment figure, outcomes, and investment payback and timeframe. Includes only what is relevant to the target audience	Key points of the report are communicated clearly. Investment requirements are mostly included and clear, only missing one of the following: investment figure, outcomes, and investment payback and timeframe	Conveys most key points of the report. Includes some of the investment requirements, but some of these requirements are unclear or vague	Lacks many of the key points from the report. Misses many of the investment requirements.
	Presentation	Presentation is completed at an appropriate pace, volume, tone, clarity, and within the time frame.	Presentation is lacking in only one of the following: appropriate pace, volume, tone, or clarity. The video is within the time frame.	At least two of the following can be improved: Pace, Volume, Tone, or Clarity of Speech. Presentation is outside of the time frame.	Many aspects of the presentation could be improved, including: Pace, Volume, Tone, or Clarity of Speech. Presentation is outside of the time frame.