

RATING EXERCISE

Individual desk-based exercise.

How to use this form

- This is an individual desk-based rating exercise, **not a group calibration exercise. (Covered in Mocks).**
- For each case (4), read the competency, the evidence indicators, and the evidence extract provided.
- Judge the quality of the evidence and assign a score using the common 1–5 scale.
- Complete all sections. The sheets can then be collected and marked by the assessor.

Purpose

This is an individual desk-based exercise for practising rating judgement.

Participants are given a sample competency, short evidence indicators, and a constructed evidence extract. Their task is to assess the quality of the evidence and rate the competency on the common 1–5 scale.

PANEL (A, B, C, etc.)		DATE	
PARTICIPANTS NAME		OBSERVER / ASSESSOR	
PARTICIPANT ID		ASSESSMENT CONTEXT	Live/Practice/Coaching

SCORING/RATING LOGIC

SCORE	ASSESSMENT BAND	ANCHOR DESCRIPTION
1	INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE	Little or no relevant example; unclear ownership; weak relevance to competency; evidence unreliable or largely theoretical.
2	BELOW EXPECTED	Some relevant evidence but fragmented, superficial, overly prompted, or weak on judgment, action, or outcome.
3	MEETS EXPECTED STANDARD	Clear and relevant evidence of competent behaviour, reasonable ownership, sound decisions, and credible outcomes.
4	STRONG	Convincing and well-structured example; strong judgment; good self-awareness; positive outcome and clear value to role/context.
5	OUTSTANDING	Highly credible, specific, and reflective evidence; strong impact; excellent judgment; exemplary standard for the competency.

CASE 2

Domain: Cross-functional

Competency: Collaborates Across Functions

Description: Works constructively with colleagues, teams, and specialist functions across organisational boundaries in order to resolve issues and achieve shared outcomes.

EVIDENCE INDICATORS

- Shows active coordination across teams or functions
- Clarifies own role versus the role of others
- Handles tension or different views constructively
- Helps move shared work forward

EVIDENCE PROVIDED

The candidate says they worked with other teams on an issue that affected several functions. They explain that communication was important and that they helped make sure people stayed aligned. They say the matter was eventually resolved and that the overall experience showed they are good at collaboration. However, they do not explain clearly what part they themselves took, what disagreement existed, or what they did that moved the issue forward.

YOUR RATING TASK

- What evidence here is strongest?
- What evidence is missing, thin, or unclear?
- How clearly is ownership shown?
- What score (1–5) would you give this competency?
- Why is this the best-supported score?
- What would need to be present for one score higher?

ASSESSOR REVIEW

		NOTES/EVIDENCE	RATING (1-5)	TOTAL RATING (1-5)
Assessor mark for the student's completed response	CASE 1			
	CASE 2			
	CASE 3			
	CASE 4			
Assessor comments on judgement quality				
Feedback point for improvement (Day 2/3)				