

Criterion	What peers look for	1 – Needs work	2 – Satisfactory	3 – Good	4 – Excellent
1. Task fit & focus	Addresses the exact question(s) for the case; states the organisation/context and the team's aim	Misses the brief or aim unclear	Partly addresses the brief; aim vague	Addresses the brief; clear aim	Laser-focused on the brief; crisp aim tied to strategy/ethics/responsibility
2. Evidence & specificity	Uses relevant, concrete info (data, examples, policy, observations) to support claims	Little/irrelevant evidence, no AI acknowledgement	Some relevant evidence, questionable AI acknowledgment	Good, specific evidence with brief appraisal, AI acknowledged	Strong, varied evidence; limitations noted, AI clearly acknowledged
3. Reasoning & solution/insight	Applies course ideas appropriately; shows a clear line from diagnosis to insight/solution	Lists ideas with no link	Some application; surface diagnosis	Clear application; coherent insight/solution	Convincing diagnosis; high-leverage insight/solution with trade-offs considered
4. Communication & time	Clear structure, inclusive delivery, readable visuals; ≤5 mins	Hard to follow; off-time	Mostly clear; minor timing/visual issues	Clear, on time, good visuals; shared speaking	Crisp structure, on time, strong signposting; professional, inclusive delivery