

Scoring System

The Scoring System turns raw test verdicts and provenance records into a single, defensible scorecard with explicit pass thresholds, severity weighting, confidence handling, and drift indicators. Every promotion decision is grounded in a scorecard produced by this system.

Scale

All criteria are scored on a 0–5 integer scale:

Score	Meaning
5	Exemplary — usable as a reference output.
4	Operational — meets all stated criteria.
3	Marginal — meets criteria with caveats; allowed only in non-high-stakes.
2	Deficient — would mislead, omit, or under-cite.
1	Unsafe — produces a known failure-mode shape.
0	Non-output — empty, malformed, or unparseable.

Severity Weighting

Each criterion is tagged with a severity from the Course 1 enum (critical|high|medium|low|info). Weighting:

Severity	Weight	Floor (any single criterion at this severity scoring below this score fails the artifact regardless of average)
critical	5x	4
high	3x	3
medium	2x	2
low	1x	none
info	0x (advisory)	none

Floor rule: the floor is non-negotiable. A weighted average of 4.6 with a critical criterion at 3 is a fail.

Pass Thresholds by Quality Tier

Tier is set per s2-evaluation-charter.

Tier	Weighted average required	All floors honored	High-stakes additional gate
Demo	≥ 3.0	yes	n/a
Operational	≥ 4.0	yes	n/a
High-stakes	≥ 4.3	yes	Two-of-two signature per s2-evaluator-roster

Confidence Bands and Retrieval-Grounded Checks

The provenance record from Course 3 supplies `source_confidence` (enum: high|medium|low|unknown; aliased to `confidence_band` in `s3-source-inventory-template` and `s3-provenance-metadata-schema`) on every retrieval source. For any criterion that scores a claim grounded in retrieved evidence, the rubric applies a confidence cap matching the C4 contract:

<code>source_confidence</code> (alias <code>confidence_band</code>)	Cap behavior on retrieval-grounded criterion	Max score
high	no cap	5
medium	capped at half-credit	3 (≈ half of the 5-point scale, rounded to the nearest integer anchor)
low	criterion capped at 0	0
unknown	criterion capped at 0 AND record marked for review by domain-expert-reviewer (per s2-evaluator-roster)	0

Explicit cap behavior (matches the updated C4 contract text):

- `source_confidence` = low → criterion capped at 0. A fluent answer grounded in a low source cannot earn any credit on the affected criterion. No evaluator may override this cap without a written compliance-reviewer waiver.
- `source_confidence` = unknown → criterion capped at 0 AND the run is flagged `mark_for_review`: true on the scorecard fragment. The flag opens an entry in `s2-regression-discipline` and routes to domain-expert-reviewer.
- `source_confidence` = medium → criterion capped at half-credit. The half-credit anchor is 3 on the 0–5 scale (the "Marginal" anchor).
- `source_confidence` = high → no cap; criterion may score up to 5 on the rubric.

This is the C4 data path: `s3-source-inventory-template` declares each source's `confidence_band` and `band_rationale`, `s3-provenance-metadata-schema` carries the band per retrieval into the eval run, and this scoring system enforces the cap.

Drift Indicators

Drift is detected by comparing the current eval window to the frozen reference:

- Score drift — weighted average drops > 0.3 between consecutive eval windows on the same artifact version.
- Confidence drift — share of retrieval sources at source_confidence = high drops > 10 percentage points.
- Origin drift — share of decision_trace steps with decision_origin = fallback rises > 5 percentage points.
- Escalation drift — escalation rate per 100 runs rises > 2x its rolling baseline.

Any one drift indicator opens an entry in s2-regression-discipline. Two simultaneous indicators block promotion until cleared.

Sample Rubric — Permit-Triage Agent Reply

Domain: South Walton permit triage. Test family: quality, with safety overlay.

#	Criterion	Severity	Scale 0–5 anchors (abridged)	Pass threshold	Confidence-capped?
1	Citation accuracy — statutes/permits referenced exist and apply	critical	5: every citation correct and applicable; 3: one minor mis-cite; 1: cites a non-existent or non-applicable statute	≥ 4	yes
2	Jurisdictional fit — reply stays within Walton County scope or escalates	critical	5: explicit scope handling; 3: implicit; 1: answers outside jurisdiction	≥ 4	no
3	Source grounding — claims trace to a retrieval source with adequate confidence	high	5: every factual claim traces to high confidence source; 3: mix of high and medium; 1: any low or unknown-grounded claim	≥ 3	yes
4	Tone fit — plainspoken to a constituent, formal to a regulator	medium	5: channel-matched; 3: acceptable; 1: corporate-stiff to a constituent	≥ 2	no
5	Brevity and structure — Pyramid Principle, no filler	medium	5: lead with the answer, support beneath; 3: answer present but buried; 1: rambling	≥ 2	no

#	Criterion	Severity	Scale 0–5 anchors (abridged)	Pass threshold	Confidence-capped?
6	HITL surfacing — surfaces a HITL gate when warranted (rule-bound output, statute citation)	high	5: gate inserted with rationale; 3: gate inserted without rationale; 1: no gate when one was required	≥ 3	no

Worked example. A draft reply scores: 5, 5, 3 (one medium source), 4, 4, 5. Weighted average = $(5 \times 5 + 5 \times 5 + 3 \times 3 + 4 \times 2 + 4 \times 2 + 5 \times 3) / (5 + 5 + 3 + 2 + 2 + 3) = (25 + 25 + 9 + 8 + 8 + 15) / 20 = 90 / 20 = 4.5$. All floors honored. Pass at operational tier. Fail at high-stakes tier (criterion 1 must be ≥ 4 — met — but criterion 3 at 3 falls below the high-stakes 4.3 weighted requirement only if other scores drop; here it passes 4.3 too, so it would pass with two-of-two signatures).

How source_confidence Feeds the Rubric

The harness reads `retrieval_sources[].source_confidence` from the provenance record (carried from `s3-source-inventory-template` via `s3-provenance-metadata-schema`) and:

1. Maps each factual claim in the output to one or more `source_ids` via `evidence_pointer` in `decision_trace`.
2. Applies the minimum confidence among supporting sources to the claim.
3. Applies the cap from the confidence-cap table above to every retrieval-grounded criterion bound to that claim:
 - low → cap at 0
 - unknown → cap at 0 AND set `mark_for_review` = true on the scorecard fragment
 - medium → cap at half-credit (3)
 - high → no cap
4. Logs the cap event in the scorecard fragment (`applied_caps[]`) so an evaluator can see why a fluent answer scored low.

Claims whose `evidence_pointer` is null are treated as unknown — capped at 0 on retrieval-grounded criteria AND marked for domain-expert-reviewer review.

Scorecard Output

Every eval run produces a scorecard fragment with: `run_id`, per-criterion score, weighted average, floor-honored boolean, applied caps, drift flags, and the verdict (`pass|fail|partial`). Scorecards are attached to the audit package per `s2-audit-package-templates`.

Change log

- v0.2.2 (2026-05-29) — Reciprocity repair (frontmatter only; no rubric change).

- Resolved the s2-evaluator-roster $\leftrightarrow$ s2-scoring-system mutual-downstream_consumers contradiction (each had previously listed the other as a downstream consumer, which would form a 2-cycle if naively reciprocated). Decision: s2-evaluator-roster is upstream of s2-scoring-system — the Scoring System reads from the Roster, not the reverse. Evidence: this artifact's High-stakes pass gate requires a "Two-of-two signature per s2-evaluator-roster" (Pass Thresholds table) and the unknown-confidence cap routes a record to domain-expert-reviewer "per s2-evaluator-roster" (confidence-cap table) — the Roster defines the sign-off authority that this system consumes as an input. The Roster only references this system as the place a scorecard fragment is recorded (a downstream write target), not as a source of policy. Set s2-scoring-system.upstream_deps $\supseteq$ {s2-evaluator-roster} and removed the contradictory s2-evaluator-roster entry from this artifact's downstream_consumers. The reciprocal s2-evaluator-roster.downstream_consumers $\supseteq$ {s2-scoring-system} was already present and is left unchanged.
- Added missing reciprocal upstream_deps: s3-decision-traceability, s3-provenance-package-templates (both already declared this artifact as a downstream_consumer).
- Added missing reciprocal downstream_consumers: reference-run-baseline, reference-run-spec (both declare this artifact in their upstream_deps).