

Written Report Rubric

Criteria	Performance Description	Scoring Bands	Weight
1. Executive Summary (150 words)	<p>Highly compelling, professional, and concise. The summary captures the essence of the client's problem and clearly articulates the proposed solution and its value. It's engaging, written in a client-facing tone, and demonstrates a strong understanding of the business context.</p> <p>There's a clear logical flow: problem → solution → impact.</p>	9–10 (Excellent)	10%
	<p>Clear and structured, but slightly less polished or precise. The main problem and solution are well explained, but the summary could be sharper or more focused on impact. Minor repetition, unclear phrasing, or lack of persuasive tone may hold it back from excellence.</p>	7–8 (Very Good)	
	<p>Adequate overview but missing detail or clarity. Identifies the issue but doesn't fully explain the cause or significance. The solution is mentioned vaguely, or the benefits are unclear. Tone may be too general, informal, or descriptive rather than persuasive.</p>	5–6 (Satisfactory)	
	<p>Partial or confusing summary. The section may focus too much on background, with little mention of the actual proposal. The value proposition is missing or unclear. The writing may lack structure or professional tone, making it hard for a client to quickly understand the main idea.</p>	3–4 (Needs Improvement)	
	<p>Incomplete or ineffective. Fails to identify the client's challenge, proposed solution, or impact. The writing may be confusing, off-topic, or too brief to be meaningful. Feels more like an introduction than a professional summary.</p>	0–2 (Minimal)	

2. Problem Definition & Analysis (200 words)	<p>Comprehensive and insightful analysis. Demonstrates a deep understanding of the client's challenge with clear evidence and logical reasoning. Accurately identifies root causes using an analytical framework (e.g. 5 Whys, SWOT) and links them to business objectives. Shows awareness of both internal and external factors influencing the issue.</p>	<p>9-10 (Excellent)</p>	<p>20%</p>
	<p>Clear understanding and structured analysis. Defines the problem well and identifies key causes, but the analysis could be more detailed or nuanced. Frameworks may be mentioned but not applied deeply. Links to client priorities are present but could be stronger.</p>	<p>7-8 (Very Good)</p>	
	<p>Basic understanding of the issue but limited analysis. Repeats much of the client brief with minimal interpretation. Mentions causes without exploring them or fails to link back to business objectives. No real analytical framework or evidence of structured thinking.</p>	<p>5-6 (Satisfactory)</p>	
	<p>Superficial or unclear definition. Misunderstands or oversimplifies the problem. No attempt to analyse root causes or connect them to wider business implications. Writing may be unclear or too general.</p>	<p>3-4 (Needs Improvement)</p>	
	<p>Incomplete or off-topic. Fails to define the problem accurately, shows little or no analysis, or describes unrelated issues. No structure, framework, or logical flow.</p>	<p>0-2 (Minimal)</p>	
3. Proposed Solution (200 words)	<p>Innovative, feasible, and client-focused solution. The proposal is original yet realistic, and it directly tackles the problem's root causes. The explanation shows strong reasoning and clear connection to the client's goals (e.g. speed, compliance, customer satisfaction). Demonstrates understanding of how the solution integrates into existing systems and adds value.</p>	<p>9-10 (Excellent)</p>	<p>20%</p>
	<p>Strong and relevant solution with minor gaps. The idea addresses the problem well but lacks some detail on implementation or feasibility. The link between solution and client objectives</p>	<p>7-8 (Very Good)</p>	

	is clear, though explanation could be more specific or persuasive.		
	Basic or partly developed idea. The solution is relevant but generic, lacking depth, innovation, or feasibility discussion. May repeat ideas already in the client brief without adding new insight.	5-6 (Satisfactory)	
	Unclear or impractical solution. The proposal is vague, unrealistic, or doesn't clearly solve the identified problem. Little connection to client needs or existing systems.	3-4 (Needs Improvement)	
	Off-topic or minimal attempt. The section lacks a coherent solution or describes unrelated ideas. No logical link to the problem or client's brief.	0-2 (Minimal)	
4. Implementation Approach (150 words)	Clear, structured, and practical implementation plan. Explains exactly how the solution would be rolled out, including logical phases (e.g. pilot → evaluation → expansion), roles, and timelines. Anticipates risks and includes mitigation strategies. Shows strong understanding of operational and organisational realities.	9-10 (Excellent)	15%
	Solid and mostly practical plan. Shows a clear structure but lacks detail in one or two areas (e.g. roles, timelines, or risk mitigation). Implementation is realistic but not fully fleshed out.	7-8 (Very Good)	
	Basic overview of implementation. Mentions some steps or actions but lacks structure or sequencing. Doesn't clearly explain how the plan would work in practice.	5-6 (Satisfactory)	
	Vague or unrealistic implementation. No clear stages, or plan seems disconnected from the proposed solution. Little awareness of feasibility or risks.	3-4 (Needs Improvement)	
	No credible implementation plan. Either missing entirely, off-topic, or purely theoretical.	0-2 (Minimal)	
5. Success	Demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of how to measure both tangible and intangible	9-10 (Excellent)	10%

Metrics & Impact (100 words)	<p>outcomes. Clearly connects each metric to the client's stated goals and the root causes identified earlier. Balances quantitative (e.g. % improvements, time reductions, adoption rates) and qualitative (e.g. satisfaction, engagement, confidence) indicators. Uses SMART-style framing (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound). Demonstrates commercial awareness by showing how success impacts both performance and reputation.</p>		
	<p>Demonstrates understanding of measurement but may focus more heavily on one type of outcome (e.g. efficiency or satisfaction, not both). Provides some quantifiable goals but lacks full justification or linkage to the wider business context. Reasonable grasp of impact, though may understate long-term or strategic effects.</p>	<p>7-8 (Very Good)</p>	
	<p>Mentions general improvement goals (e.g. "faster," "better," "more efficient") without measurable data. Limited or no justification for why these metrics matter to the client. Focus may be too narrow (e.g. only customer outcomes, ignoring operational or financial ones).</p>	<p>5-6 (Satisfactory)</p>	
	<p>Measures are disconnected from the client's problem or proposed solution. Overly simplistic or unrelated indicators (e.g. "number of meetings held"). No clear link between the solution's actions and expected results. Fails to show understanding of data-driven evaluation or practical feasibility.</p>	<p>3-4 (Needs Improvement)</p>	
	<p>The section is missing, purely descriptive, or entirely off-topic. No attempt to connect impact to client goals or measurable outcomes. Lacks awareness of what "success" means in a business context.</p>	<p>0-2 (Minimal)</p>	
6. Use of AI in Proposal Development	<p>Clearly explains how specific AI tools were used at different proposal stages (e.g. idea generation, research synthesis, structure refinement). Demonstrates understanding of both value added (efficiency, creativity, clarity)</p>	<p>9-10 (Excellent)</p>	<p>10%</p>

(100 words)	and limitations (bias, inaccuracy, ethical issues). Reflects maturely on how human judgment complemented AI input. Shows transparency and professionalism in describing the process.		
	Identifies one or more ways AI supported their work. Mentions drawbacks or human input but lacks depth or specific examples. Demonstrates awareness of responsible use but in a surface-level way.	7-8 (Very Good)	
	Mentions using AI but doesn't explain how or why. No clear examples of its impact on the proposal's quality or development. Lacks discussion of limitations or human oversight.	5-6 (Satisfactory)	
	Little to no explanation of AI's role or value. May imply overreliance on AI without demonstrating personal contribution. No mention of ethical awareness or critical review. Suggests limited understanding of AI's strengths or risks.	3-4 (Needs Improvement)	
	Omits this section entirely, or makes irrelevant comments. Demonstrates no awareness of AI's role in the proposal process. May include ethically concerning statements (e.g. full reliance on AI-generated work).	0-2 (Minimal)	
7. Conclusion & Next Steps (100 words)	Clearly restates the key recommendation and its business impact (e.g. time savings, customer satisfaction, cost efficiency). Presents logical, specific next steps (e.g. pilot phase, stakeholder workshop, performance review). Connects the proposal's value to the client's strategic goals. Ends with a confident, action-oriented tone.	9-10 (Excellent)	10%
	Summarises recommendations clearly but without a strong sense of urgency or vision. Provides next steps, but they may be general ("test", "monitor") rather than concrete. Some mention of client value, but not fully developed.	7-8 (Very Good)	
	Repeats earlier points without adding momentum or closure. Next steps are vague or unrealistic. Weak link between proposal	5-6 (Satisfactory)	

	outcomes and client goals.		
	Ends abruptly, without summarising key insights or recommendations. No clear direction for next steps. Tone may be uncertain or unprofessional ("I think this might work").	3-4 (Needs Improvement)	
	No real summary or recommendation. No actionable next steps. May contain new, unrelated information or errors that confuse the reader.	0-2 (Minimal)	
8. Structure, Style & Professionalism	Logical flow: each section builds naturally on the previous. Headings, subheadings, and formatting enhance readability. Style is professional, concise, and persuasive; sentences are clear and free of errors. Tone is appropriate for a consulting audience, confident without being informal. Demonstrates attention to detail and consistency throughout.	9-10 (Excellent)	5%
	Logical sequence, minor lapses in flow. Headings and formatting mostly consistent. Style generally professional; minor lapses in clarity, conciseness, or tone. Few minor errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation.	7-8 (Very Good)	
	Sections identifiable but may lack logical flow. Formatting inconsistent or cluttered. Language occasionally unclear, verbose, or informal. Several grammar or spelling errors, but meaning can be understood.	5-6 (Satisfactory)	
	Sections may be missing or unordered. Inconsistent formatting and poor readability. Language unclear, overly informal, or repetitive. Frequent grammar/spelling errors hinder professional presentation.	3-4 (Needs Improvement)	
	Proposal difficult to navigate. Formatting missing or inconsistent throughout. Language largely informal, unprofessional, or incomprehensible. Many errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Tone inappropriate for a business audience.	0-2 (Minimal)	

Final Grade Interpretation

Score Range (/100)	Descriptor	Summary
90–100	Excellent	Demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the client’s problem, backed by strong analytical reasoning, original thinking, and a highly professional tone. Each section is complete, coherent, and aligned with real-world consulting standards. The report is structured logically, with persuasive storytelling and clear evidence of commercial awareness. All writing is polished, free from errors, and visually well-formatted. AI use is transparent, ethical, and adds genuine value. This is a client-ready, industry-standard submission.
75–89	Very Good	A clear, well-reasoned, and professionally presented report that effectively communicates insights and recommendations. Shows strong understanding of the client’s needs and applies appropriate analytical thinking. Some sections may lack the polish or depth of an excellent submission (e.g., slightly generic recommendations, minor flow issues, or less persuasive tone). Still demonstrates clarity, structure, and professionalism throughout.
60–74	Satisfactory	Meets the core requirements but lacks the sophistication or insight expected in professional consulting work. The problem, solution, and analysis are identifiable but may be underdeveloped or unevenly detailed. Writing is generally clear but may include some inconsistencies, repetitive phrasing, or weak transitions. Formatting and tone are adequate but not client-ready. Limited evidence of original thought or deep analysis.
40–59	Needs Improvement	Shows partial understanding of the task and some effort to analyse the problem but lacks structure, clarity, or professional polish. Arguments are

		weakly supported or disconnected from client objectives. Sections may be incomplete, repetitive, or off-topic. Writing style is inconsistent and may include numerous grammatical or formatting issues. Limited awareness of commercial context or practical feasibility. Minimal or unclear use of AI.
0-39	Minimal	The report is incomplete, unclear, or significantly below expected standard. Lacks logical flow, insight, or understanding of the client brief. May be purely descriptive, generic, or copied. Professional tone and structure are missing. Errors, poor formatting, and unclear writing make it difficult to follow. Fails to demonstrate analytical ability, client understanding, or practical recommendations. No evidence of appropriate AI use or reflective practice.