

Scorecard

5-minute walkthrough of a proposed architecture — B1

Score the L1 and L7 recordings using this rubric. For each criterion, assign 0, 1, or 2 points. Total per recording: /10.

Criterion	Below level (0)	At level — B1 (1-2)	Above level (2)
Communicative effectiveness — did the design authority get what they needed to decide?	Design authority cannot decide after listening; asks for the walkthrough to be redone or for the architecture pack to be re-shared	Design authority can approve, request specific changes, or escalate in the same meeting; minor clarifying questions only	Design authority acts immediately; questions are refinements, not requests for missing information
Clarity & structure — are the five beats present and followable?	Architecture is described before the recommendation (or never); trade-offs and decision request are tangled or missing	Five beats present and in the stated order; uses simple transitions between them ("on the problem", "on the proposed architecture", "to summarise")	Opens with stance + one-line rationale in a single sentence; closes with a named decision request in under 30 seconds
Language control — is grammar stable enough for credibility?	Switches between past and present when describing the client's current state; leaves sentences unfinished when the architecture detail gets dense	Tenses hold across each beat; uses modals for trade-offs and asks ("we'd recommend", "could we approve"); occasional article and preposition errors	Modality used accurately for likelihood vs. commitment ("may not scale" vs. "will not scale"); conditionals used for sequencing decisions ("if the design authority approves the catalog approach, we can start integration in sprint 3")
Lexical appropriacy — right words for a client design authority?	Uses vague verbs ("do", "make", "have") where architecture-specific verbs exist; describes architectural patterns without naming them	Names architecture actions with precise verbs (orchestrate, decouple, federate, expose, integrate); uses standard BSS/OSS terms (catalog, order management, mediation, charging) without glossing; some translation-style phrasing	Uses domain-standard lexis naturally (idempotency, blast radius, eventual consistency, anti-corruption layer); switches register smoothly between technical detail and executive framing
Time discipline — 5 minutes, all	Over 5:30 or under 3:00; at least one beat	4:30–5:15; all five beats included; pacing even	Confident pacing with extra time on the

Criterion	Below level (0)	At level — B1 (1-2)	Above level (2)
beats covered?	dropped to fit (usually trade-offs or the decision request)	across beats	proposed solution and trade-offs (the highest-stakes beats); ends cleanly, not cut off

Scoring

Score	Definition
2	Matches the At level or Above level descriptor
1	Partially at level — some At-level features, some Below
0	Matches the Below level descriptor

Pass thresholds

A learner passes the course if either threshold is met:

Threshold	Definition	What it proves
Performance	L7 total \geq 6/10	Learner can perform the task to standard
Improvement	(L7 total – L1 total) \geq 2 points	The course added value

Grade bands (assigned on L7 score)

L7 total	Band	Description
9–10	Distinction	Performs above level. Minor refinements only.
7–8	Pass with merit	Performs at level reliably.
6	Pass	Task communicatively achieved. Some criteria below level.
0–5	Not yet passing	Task not yet reliably achieved.

Note on the 5th criterion. Interaction management is excluded because the walkthrough is delivered as a monologue — design authority questions and discussion happen after. Time discipline replaces it: covering all five beats in 5 minutes without sacrificing trade-offs or the decision request is the binding constraint.