

Team Project Brief: Rubric

A holistic guide is provided that should inform the whole report. Each section listed below should also meet the standards set by the Focus Areas of the holistic guide in addition to its own specific requirements.

Section	Focus Area	Exemplary (100% - 90%)	Accomplished (89% - 70%)	Developing (69% - 51%)	Beginning (50%-0%)
Holistic Guide	Audience	Every section of the report is consistently written for a specific appropriate audience	The report is sometimes inconsistent in which audience it seems to be written for	The report is frequently inconsistent or confusing in which audience it seems to be written for	The report seems to be written for the assignment markers and not for an appropriate target audience
	Intention	The report has a clear purpose or intention	The purpose or intention of the report is somewhat understandable	The purpose or intention of the report can be understood with some difficulty	The report does not have a clear purpose or intention
	Message	The report delivers a clear message	The message of the report is mostly clear with some more nuanced aspects unclear	The message of the report can be deduced or understood with some difficulty	The report has no clear message
	Explanation	The purpose and message are well supported throughout the report with relevant well-structured information	The information and structure in the report effectively supports the message and purpose of the report	The information in the report somewhat supports the purpose and message	The information in the report is not relevant and is not well-structured
Reporting (10%)	Flow	The story flows well from one section to the other; each section has its own introduction	The narrative flows well from one section to another; some transitions between sections are not very smooth	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 sometimes confusing; not so easy to read	The organisation of the report is often confusing and not easy to read, but can be deciphered	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	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	Many spelling and grammatical errors that dramatically 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. Some minor errors or inconsistencies	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 (30%)	Summary	Summarises all essential information from the report	Summarises the majority of essential information from the report. Some irrelevant information may be included	Some essential information from the report is missing or significant information is irrelevant	Most essential information from the report is missing
	Recommendations	Clear recommendation of the shortlisted options to be investigated further.	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

	Stand alone	The section is stand alone; provides a reader with sufficient context and information to make a decision without reading the body of the report in detail	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 section provides some idea of what the report is proposing but the reader needs to get significantly 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 (35%)	Project Background	Clearly states the purpose of this business case; introduces the background and context for the problem.	The purpose of this business case could be more specifically stated; some relevant background & context necessary to understand the problem is provided	The purpose of this business case is unclear; relevant background and context necessary to understand the problem is barely provided.	The purpose of this business case is not presented; relevant background & context necessary to understand problem is missing
	Problem space	Clear specific problem statements, also provides a clear idea of how the problem evolved from a broad conception to the specific statement	The problem statements are reasonably specific; gives some idea of how the problem evolved from problem space to problem statement	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	The problem statements are very broad or still stuck at the problem space stage; there is no problem evolution or evidence of problem analysis
	Stakeholders	Clear identification of stakeholders, stakeholder analysis is clearly shown	Stakeholders identified, one obvious stakeholder may be missing, stakeholder analysis and reasoning is discussed with some nuanced aspects missing	Stakeholders broadly identified; not all stakeholders mentioned; stakeholder analysis and reasoning is mentioned but not clear	Stakeholders are not specified or not mentioned; stakeholder analysis is missing
	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, some may be poorly described or justified; mostly 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 somewhat identified, some may be missing; poor description of their importance; poor 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 very 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
	Key Assumptions	Assumptions are clearly connected & relevant to the problem and are complete.	Assumptions are connected & relevant to the problem, some more nuanced assumptions may be missing.	Assumptions are not very clear in how they are connected or relevant to the problem; or key assumptions are missing.	Assumptions are missing or not connected or relevant to the problem.
	Long list 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.
Economic Case (25%)	KSF Assessment	Relevant criteria using the key success factors to carry out options assessment. Clearly discusses the reasoning behind any discounted options being carried forward with clear justification.	Mostly relevant criteria and key success factors are used to carry out the options assessment, one of the criteria may not be relevant. Discusses the reasoning behind any discounted options being carried forward with some justification	Not all criteria are 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 and 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 some 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. A major impact of the solution has been identified, quantified, and monetised using a reasonable method that is well supported. Discussion of other major impacts of implementing the solution are identified and well discussed with good justification and support.	The logic behind the selection of the shortlisted options is communicated well, some nuanced discussion may be missing. A major impact of the solution has been identified, quantified, and monetised using a reasonable method with some support. Other major impacts of implementing the solution are identified and discussed with some justification and support. Some nuanced aspects of these major impacts may be missing from the discussion.	The logic behind the selection of the shortlisted options is somewhat explained. An attempt at quantifying one of the major impacts has been made but was confusing or poorly done. Other major impacts were poorly identified, missing, or discussed with little depth.	The logic to select the shortlisted options is confusing or missing. Quantification of any major impacts are missing; qualification of other impacts is confusing or missing.