

<b>Component</b>	<b>Exemplary Analysis</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>NC</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory Analysis</b>
Understanding (40%)	<p>Demonstrates understanding of relevant technical concepts.</p> <p>Demonstrates understanding of relevant policy concepts.</p> <p>Recommendation is tailored to the intended recipient given their real-world incentives and interests.</p>					<p>Does not consider policy or technical concepts, or exhibits deeply flawed understanding.</p> <p>Recommendation is incompatible with the incentives and interests of the recipient.</p>
Argumentation (30%)	<p>Claims are supported by compelling logic and evidence.</p> <p>Analyses alternative options and demonstrates why they are not suitable.</p>					<p>Claims are unsupported, or rely on faulty logic and/or demonstrably false evidence.</p> <p>Fails to consider or routinely misrepresents counter arguments.</p>
Multidimensional thinking (20%)	<p>Students consider a wide range of short- and long-term implications of the recommendation.</p>					<p>Recommendation is short-sighted and/or considers a very narrow range of possible implications.</p>
Presentation (10%)	<p>Technical concepts are clearly and concisely explained.</p> <p>The analysis is well-structured and easy to follow.</p>					<p>Fails to define or critically misunderstands technical terms.</p> <p>The analysis lacks structure and is incoherent.</p>