|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Fail (>50)** | **Pass (51-64)** | **Credit (65-74)** | **Distinction (75-84)** | **High Distinction (85+)** |
| **Planning** | Evidence of planning and research is mostly absent or shows no independent consideration. The project scope is not identified. The proposed schedule of work was unachievable with resources/time available. | Planning is present but missing important information and the scope is not clear. The research does not add support to the plan of work. The plan of work was unachievable and required substantial revisions during the project. | The scope of work is clear with some supporting research and analysis presented. The plan of work was mostly executable but required some revisions for proposed outcomes to be achieved. | The scope of work is clear and supported by research and analysis of contextual factors.  The plan of work was feasible but required minor revisions to accommodate constraints that were not identified during planning. | The scope of work is clearly identified and considered. The plan is supported by in depth research and analysis and considers future risks. A feasible plan of work was provided that considered all relevant factors and risks (e.g. time, equipment, skills) |
| **Execution/Development and realisation** | The project does not contain aspects of professional practice. Techniques, materials, and technical skills are absent as is a finished product. | Evidence that a minimal range/level of technical skills were used to contribute to execution of the project. Initial ideas were not developed as much as they could have been. | A range of materials and techniques were used but their application could be improved or the choice of methods was not entirely appropriate. Ideas were explored but not fully developed/realised. | A high level of technical skill was demonstrated and ideas were developed and executed. Selection of materials and techniques was mostly appropriate for the task, some adjustments may be beneficial. | Technical skills were demonstrated to a professional level, ideas were developed thoroughly and successfully realised. Selection of materials and techniques was appropriate for the task. |
| **Creativity** | The approach is conventional and unoriginal. There are no discernible elements of innovation or experimentation. | The approach is conventional and mostly unoriginal. There are brief moments of innovation or experimentation. | The approach displays elements of creativity but this is fragmented or not explored fully. The project contains elements of originality and attempts to be innovative or experimental. | A creative approach is present and it is justified. It is mostly original but relies on some conventions; it is nonetheless innovative or experimental. Exploration and experimentation is reflected on. | An individual response to the issue is present and justified. Evidence of significant exploration and experimentation followed by reflection and innovation. The project challenges conventions and does so effectively. |
| **Adaption and evaluation** | The project cannot identify key iterative moments (skills or ideas) as part of their development process. Moments of feedback are ignored. | The project follows key iterative moments (skills or ideas) as part of their development process without identification or reflection. Moments of feedback are acknowledged but not reflected on. | The project is able to identify key iterative moments (skills or ideas) as part of their development process. Moments of feedback are used as evidence toward the project’s evolution. | The project is able to compare and contrast key iterative moments (skills or ideas) as part of their development process. Feedback and evaluation are integrated into the project. | The project is able to reflexively engage in key iterative moments (skills or ideas) as part of the development process and any adaptations are appropriate. Feedback and evaluation are integrated throughout as evidence to complement reflective claims. |
| **Project Outcomes** | The final product and artist/designer statement is not present or is incomplete. | The final product and artist/designer statement demonstrates a basic attempt at addressing the task requirement but the product has flaws that need addressing to make it fit for purpose. | The final product and artist/designer statement demonstrate a reasonable level of skill with room for improvement. The product is useable but would benefit from some modifications. | The final product and artist/designer statement are high quality and are fit for purpose/meet all the requirements of the task | The final product and artist/designer statement is at a professional/sophisticated standard that is fit for purpose/meets all the stated requirements of the task and goes beyond to add value or a unique contribution to the field. |
| **Professional Presentation of Work** | Associated documentation does not follow the expected conventions of professional practice or the discipline. There are no supporting visual elements and the formatting is poor. | Associated documentation follows the expected conventions of professional practice or the discipline, but requires substantial revision. The visual elements are inconsistent or detracting. | Associated documentation follows the expected conventions of professional practice or the discipline, but could be organised and presented better. The visual elements are mostly consistent and enhancing. | Associated documentation follows the expected conventions of professional practice or the discipline, but could be organised better. The visual elements are consistent and engaging. | Associated documentation follows the expected conventions of professional practice or the discipline, no revision is needed. The visual elements are consistent, aesthetically pleasing and enhance the project. |

**NB: Not all of the criteria need to be selected. Your selection will depend on the focus of the task and the learning outcomes.**