|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unacceptable (<65) | Satisfactory (65-74) | Good (75-84) | Outstanding (85-100) |
| Quality of Response | The challenge or issue addressed is irrelevant to the rise of digital technologies, or is poorly described, missing several important details. | The challenge or issue addressed is relevant to the rise of digital technologies, but either has simple, well-known possibilities to address it or is missing important details for the subsequent analysis. | The challenge or issue addressed is relevant to the rise of digital technologies, and has not been resolved. It is effectively explained to facilitate understanding. | The challenge or issue addressed is highly relevant to the rise of digital technologies and poses a concern that needs to be addressed. It is explained thoroughly yet succinctly. |
| The recommendation does not address the challenge or issue raised in the paper. Large gaps in evidence and reasoning leave a reader confused or unconvinced. | The recommendation addresses the challenge or issue, but the lack or poor quality of evidence, or unclear reasoning (or both) weaken the argument. | The recommendation addresses the challenge or issue raised appropriately, with good evidence and reasoning, which is well-grounded and persuasive. | The recommendation offers an innovative or original approach to the challenge, justified with solid, well-used evidence and reasoning. The recommendation provides something new that has not been expressed elsewhere either through synthesizing ideas or evaluating in new ways. |
| Several stakeholders are missing from the analysis. An explanation of how stakeholders are impacted is largely absent, or only superficial. | Relevant stakeholders are identified, but their stake or the implications of the recommendation are not clearly explained. | Most of the stakeholders impacted by the recommendation are identified, with an explanation of how they will be impacted. | The report offers a nuanced understanding of stakeholders and their interests as impacted by the recommendation, with a thoughtful explanation of how they will be impacted. |
| Relevant limitations and disadvantages are largely missing from the analysis. | Key limitations or potential disadvantages are missing, or limitations/disadvantages presented are not fully relevant to the recommendation as presented. | The paper addresses limitations or disadvantages associated with the recommendation using good analysis. | The paper clearly and carefully addresses key limitations or disadvantages of the recommendation, demonstrating fairness and good critical thinking. |
| Document Structure | The document is difficult to follow or understand because there is no clear structure to help the reader understand the development of ideas. | The structure of the document lacks any obvious logic. Claims are made, but unclear structure makes them hard to follow. This may be evident through long, meandering paragraphs or lack of headings. | The report demonstrates a visible and logical structure through such means as headings, clear topic sentences, and paragraphs that develop a single topic. | *As per Good* + the report uses subtle transitions or logic developments to guide the reader into clear understanding. |
| Paragraphs appear to show lack of control over ideas and no sense of logical development. Topic statements may be unclear, and paragraph transitions are non-existent or confusing. | Paragraph problems may force readers to re-read to keep the flow of the logic. Topic sentences are not clear or get buried in the paragraph, and transitions do not show a development of ideas. | Paragraphs are organized logically and are mostly functional, with clear topic statements and transitions, although occasional problems may force a reader to re-read. | Paragraphs build logically and follow clearly, directing the reader. Paragraphs have clear topic statements and show excellent transitions. |
| Clarity of Communi-cation | Sentences are sometimes so confusing that the reader cannot decipher meaning. This may be a result of grammatical errors or vocabulary problems. | Sentence structure is mostly clear, but grammatical errors, awkward organization, or vocabulary errors may occasionally force the reader to re-read or leave ideas incomplete. | Sentence structure, grammar, and vocabulary are sufficiently clear that they do not obstruct reading or inhibit understanding. | *As per Good* + word choices and sentence structures create precise and nuanced understanding. Writing is concise. |
| Writing is largely narrative rather than analytical; or writing involves inappropriate use of “I think” or “in my opinion” due to poor substantive evidence. | Writing combines narrative and analysis in ways that limit effectiveness; may use first person inappropriately due to lack of confidence in ideas. | Writing is largely analytical and uses narrative in limited and effective ways. The report balances first person appropriately. | Writing contains any narrative within the larger analytical focus as example and uses first person appropriately. |

**Student Name:**

**Grade: 83**

**Summative Comments:**

Specific examples do a good job of explaining the recommendation. Questions of implementation or motive could be discussed further.

Sometimes, the writing is a bit casual.

Structure is generally good, with only a few awkward sentences placements and transitions.

**Annoyances (check all that apply):**

Missing name (1%)Missing student number (1%)Missing title (1%)

Citation error(s) (1-5%) Over 1000 words (1-3%)