

ASSESSMENT GUIDE

What good work looks like

Criteria for reviewing your work, using feedback and making a considered correction.

This is the proposed public assessment rubric for the editorial courseware edition. It is not an approved qualification standard. The specific candidate brief controls the task, permitted tools, word limit and criterion weights. Different well-supported conclusions can receive equal credit.

Work-product criteria

Criterion	Strong evidence	Developing evidence	Evidence needing substantial correction
Substantive analysis	Identifies the material legal question, applies the relevant rule in its jurisdiction, handles a credible alternative and explains remaining uncertainty	Identifies the main issue but application or alternative analysis is incomplete	Gives a categorical conclusion without relevant authority or ignores a material issue
Document and numerical accuracy	Reconciles sources and definitions, shows assumptions/formulas, tests boundaries and preserves conflicting evidence	Mostly correct output with a traceable but unresolved inconsistency	Invents missing terms, silently repairs disputed evidence or produces materially wrong numbers
Commercial judgment	Connects issues to consequences and offers coherent, authorised options	Suggests plausible changes without explaining trade-offs or decision authority	Lists risks without consequences or accepts a commitment outside the mandate
Communication and handover	Clear recommendation, audience-appropriate explanation, indexed evidence, responsible owner and next action	Understandable but diffuse; some decisions or owners remain unclear	An approver cannot identify what to decide or what the output establishes

Criterion	Strong evidence	Developing evidence	Evidence needing substantial correction
Process and accountable tool use	Preserves originals, records permitted assistance, tests results and demonstrates personal understanding	Declares tools but provides limited evidence of review or reproducibility	Presents unverified output as established fact or cannot explain material choices

For the capstone, weights are 30/25/15/15/15 respectively. Assessors score each criterion using the evidence and approved anchors, then explain the aggregate judgment. These descriptors are not an automatic points-to-level conversion. The weekly practice assignments use the same dimensions for feedback without awarding a qualification grade.

Negotiation evidence

Preparation means a ranked issue list, alternatives, linked concessions and authority. Listening means testing an assumption and responding to what the other person actually said. A coherent proposal connects scope, price, timetable and risk where relevant. Professional conduct means recording a position honestly and seeking instructions when required. Handover means that the next person can distinguish proposed, provisionally agreed, approved and unresolved terms.

You do not earn credit merely for reaching agreement, winning a concession or speaking most. A justified pause can demonstrate stronger competence than an unauthorised agreement. The published N1 criteria are preparation 20%, listening/clarification 20%, proposals 25%, authority/conduct 20% and handover 15%.

Oral defence evidence

Explain your own reasoning, reconstruct a material calculation or source trail, adapt to a changed fact, and identify the boundary of your conclusion. You may say that a question requires additional research or specialist review, but should explain what must be checked and why. The assessor examines reasoning, not accent, confidence or resemblance to a memorised script.

O1 weights are ownership/reasoning 35%, response to variation 30%, evidence/control awareness 20% and clarity/professional boundaries 15%. Reasonable adjustments may change the communication method while preserving individual reasoning and response to a new fact.

Critical failures and fair process

Examples requiring a separate integrity/safety review include fabricated sources or approvals, deliberate undisclosed copying, exposure of prohibited real data, and knowingly presenting an unapproved commitment as authorised. A disagreement about a defensible commercial position is not a critical failure. Neither a single typo nor an AI detector result automatically establishes misconduct.

The assessor records the conduct, evidence, applicable rule and learner response. The learner can explain, correct a genuine misunderstanding and challenge an adverse finding through the approved process. No automatic numerical average can cancel an unresolved critical failure, but the allegation itself is not a final decision.

Feedback and next attempt

Feedback should identify: criterion; specific evidence; consequence; a concrete correction; and what would demonstrate improvement. "Be more commercial" is inadequate. "Your memo requests a longer term without calculating the total commitment or identifying the approver; add those before recommending acceptance" is useful.

Reassessment uses a reviewed parallel task, not an answer you have already memorised. The draft instructor materials contain change specifications; a complete and comparable variant must be approved before a formal reassessment. Academic thresholds and service standards must be approved and communicated before a live cohort starts.