

DECO7381 Assessment 3 Grade Sheet – this rubric must be taken in conjunction with the task sheet

Team Name:			Offline Grade Sheet:	
Grade Band	Team Portfolio and Reflection (ECP 2, 3.)	Product Prototype (ECP 1, 4, 5.)	Codebase (ECP 1.)	Kickstarter video (ECP skills, 6.)
High Distinction	The team portfolio is creative, engaging, keeps to time and shows excellent reflection on the process. The team demonstrates how they worked together to achieve the project build goals and have demonstrated what they have learned from the process.	There is no doubt the team built an excellent and innovative prototype product. The prototype is highly usable, easy to run and test, the build has excellent instructions for novice users to get started quickly. An outstanding product.	The team's codebase is very well architected, demonstrates excellent practice and quality, naming conventions are excellent and consistent, the codebase is well documented and very readable.	The team's kickstarter video is excellent and their messaging is clear, and they keep to time. They impressed with their initiative and demonstrate the need for their product incredibly well as well as why stakeholders should invest in them.
Distinction	The team portfolio is very good, keeps to time and team members demonstrate clear reflective thinking about the outcomes of the project.	The team has built a very good prototype product, that is usable and easy to run and test. There is some evidence of initiative.	The team's codebase is very good, demonstrates excellent practice and quality, well documented and very readable.	The team's kickstarter video is very good, keeps to time. The messaging is clear. They motivate the need for their product. It's clear why to invest.
Credit	The team portfolio is good, keeps to time and team members demonstrate some evidence of reflective thinking about the outcomes of the project.	The team's prototype shows intended functionality, usability is adequate, and testing and running is easy. Product does not demonstrate much initiative.	The team's codebase is good, demonstrates good adherence to standards and quality, quite readable.	The team's kickstarter video is good, keeps to time. The messaging is a little confused. The need for their product and why to invest isn't clear.
Pass	The team portfolio overruns and/or team members demonstrate minimal evidence of reflective thinking about the outcomes of the project.	The team's prototype is basic and it's clear that features demonstrated are not well thought out. Usability is basic, requires effort to test and run.	The team's codebase is adequate, demonstrates basic adherence to standards and quality, barely readable.	The team's kickstarter video is OK, and/overruns. Their messaging is confusing. The need for their product and why to invest is unclear.
Marginal Fail	The team portfolio overruns, and/or team members demonstrate little evidence of reflective thinking about the outcomes of the project.	The team's build is poor in terms of working functionality. Usability is poor, requires too much effort to test and run.	The team's codebase is poor, lacks structure and adherence to standards, difficult to read.	The team's kickstarter video is poor, and/or overruns their messaging is very confusing. They demonstrate little value. Not investable.
Fail	The team portfolio is poor and there is no evidence of reflective thinking about the outcomes of the project.	The team's build is badly executed and the build files can't be executed or tested.	The team's codebase is poor, lacks structure, no standards, very difficult to follow.	The team's kickstarter video is very confusing and/or overruns massively and is difficult to follow
	Comments:			

DECO7381 Assessment 3 Grade Sheet – this rubric must be taken in conjunction with the task sheet

Team Name:			Presentation date/time:	
Grade Band	Team Collaboration (<i>ECP 2, 3.</i>)	Live Demo (<i>ECP 1, 4, 5.</i>)	EXPO Interactive demo Presentation (<i>ECP skills, 1, 6.</i>)	Team Conference Paper (marked offline) (<i>ECP 6.</i>)
High Distinction	The team collaborated highly effectively. Members had in depth familiarity with the project and tools used. The team showed initiative in helping each other achieve the project build and developed strong collaboration skills.	The live demo leaves no doubt that the team has built an excellent product. The team is confident when explaining the features of the product. The design shows the team made excellent ethical and build choices, shows a high level of initiative, and usability.	The team's interactive presentation and booth are excellent with well designed visual aids. They make clear why the product is important and why it's better than others. Surprising creativity, capable of winning best in show.	The team conference paper is excellent, well structured, well written and well formatted (uses CHI template and bibliography). Shows excellent evidence of research capability, an excellent analysis, well chosen analysis criteria. Thoughtful and a pleasure to read.
Distinction	The team collaborated well and everyone clearly understands the project. Evidence of some initiative and good collaboration skills.	The live demo shows the team has built a very good product. The team explains the features well. The design shows the team made good ethical/build choices.	The team's interactive presentation and booth are very good. They make clear why the product is important and why it's better than others.	The team conference paper is very good, well structured, well written. Shows good evidence of research capability, good analysis and criteria.
Credit	The team collaborated to build the project at a basic level and showed little initiative.	The live demo shows the team built a good product. The team explains the features. The design shows the team made fair ethical/build choices.	The team's interactive presentation and booth are good. They make clear why the product is important comparative analysis is basic.	The team conference paper is OK, well structured, well written. Shows some evidence of research capability, analysis and choice of criteria.
Pass	The team's collaboration skills are minimal. There was some evidence of team communication and collaboration.	The live demo shows the team built an adequate product. The team can barely explain the features. The team made minimal ethical/build choices.	The team's interactive presentation and booth are adequate. They make clear why the product is important comparative analysis is passable.	The team conference paper is passable, adequately structured and written. Shows minimal evidence of research capability, analysis and choice of criteria.
Marginal Fail	The team showed little evidence of collaborating towards building the project.	The live demo shows the team built a poor product. The team can barely explain the features. The team shows little evidence of ethical/build choices.	The team's interactive presentation and booth are poor. It's unclear why the product is important comparative analysis is poor.	The team conference paper is poor, badly structured and written. Shows little evidence of research capability, analysis and poor choice of criteria.
Fail	No evidence of collaboration to build the project.	The live demo was poor. The team is unable to explain features. They show no evidence of ethical/build choices.	The team's presentation and booth are poor. Value of the product is unclear comparative analysis non-existent.	The team conference paper is hard to follow. Shows no evidence of research or analysis capability.
Overall Grade:	Comments:			Date: