

### **Rubric Review ( /45)**

	5-4	3	2-1
<b>Analysis of Agent</b>	Provides a rich, detailed analysis of the agent. Uses specific examples to support claims about tone, politeness, and understanding.	Clearly describes the agent's performance. Covers all prompts (politeness, listening, clarity, tone) with good supporting details.	Describes the agent but uses general terms ("He was nice") without specific examples. May miss one of the prompts.
<b>Clarity of Context</b>	Clearly and concisely identifies the company, the <i>specific</i> purpose of the call, and the date/time. The goal is perfectly clear.	Identifies the company and purpose. May be slightly vague on the specific goal or missing the date/time.	Identifies the company but is vague about the purpose of the call (e.g., "to ask a question").
<b>Agent Competence &amp; Efficiency</b>	Student thoroughly evaluates the agent's knowledge and problem-solving skill. Clearly distinguishes between <i>sounding</i> confident and <i>being</i> correct. Assesses the efficiency of the interaction.	Student clearly describes the agent's competence, whether they seemed knowledgeable, and if they explained the solution well.	Student states if the agent <i>seemed</i> knowledgeable but doesn't analyze their actual problem-solving process or the clarity of their explanation.

<b>Resolution &amp; Outcome</b>	<p>Student clearly analyzes the final outcome. Did it <i>fully</i> solve the problem? Was it the <i>best</i> possible solution?</p> <p>Analyzes the call closing (e.g., "Is there anything else...").</p>	<p>Student clearly states the final resolution (solved, not solved, partially) and accurately describes how the call ended.</p>	<p>Student states the outcome but with little detail. The description of the call closing is missing or vague.</p>
<b>Critical Reflection &amp; Evidence</b>	<p>Student provides a sharp, insightful reflection. The "best" and "worst" parts are specific and well-chosen. The overall rating is strongly <b>justified using evidence</b> from the body of the review.</p>	<p>Student provides a clear reflection with good examples for the "best" and "worst" parts. The overall rating is logical and supported by the review.</p>	<p>Student's reflection is superficial. The "best"/"worst" parts are vague ("it was fast"). The rating seems disconnected from the review.</p>
<b>Clarity &amp; Professionalism</b>	<p>Writing is exceptionally clear, precise, and professional. Uses objective language to describe the experience (e.g., "The agent spoke...").</p>	<p>Writing is clear and easy to understand. The tone is appropriate for a review.</p>	<p>Writing is generally understandable but may be unclear in places. The tone is too casual or vague.</p>
<b>Grammar &amp; Mechanics</b>	<p>Virtually free of any spelling, punctuation, or grammatical errors. Polished</p>	<p>Contains only a few minor errors that do not interfere with reading.</p>	<p>Contains several noticeable errors that may occasionally make the writing</p>

	and well-edited.		unclear.
<b>Justification of Rating</b>	The final rating (e.g., "Good," "Bad") is strongly and logically <b>justified using specific evidence</b> from the body of the review.	The final rating is logical and clearly supported by the main points of the review.	The final rating feels disconnected or arbitrary; it is not clearly supported by the review's content.
<b>Conclusion</b>	Provides a sharp, insightful reflection. The "best" and "worst" parts are specific, well-chosen, and show critical thinking.	Clearly identifies the "best" and "worst" parts with good, logical reasons.	Identifies "best"/"worst" parts, but the reasoning is superficial or vague (e.g., "it was good").