

## Marking Scheme for Deliverable 5

Mark each section out of 10 (whole marks only) – except for *Presentation*, which is marked with 1 or 0 marks. This should follow the generic assessment descriptors used within the University (see last page). A specific mapping of these criteria to each section is given below.

### Team Report

#### Evaluation of Team Work [weight 6]

Marks	Description
8-10	<b>Excellent:</b> Excellent evaluation of team work, including reflection and introspection. Ability to reflect clearly on why the team worked well (or did not work well). Excellent understanding of agile methodologies and excellent ability to contextualise and apply concepts and principles learnt in the module to the specific team situation.
7	<b>Very Good:</b> Very good evaluation of team work. Very good understanding of agile methodologies, very good ability to contextualise and apply concepts and principles learnt in the module to the specific team situation.
6	<b>Good:</b> Good evaluation of team work. Good understanding of agile methodologies, and good ability to apply concepts and principles learnt in the module to the specific team situation.
5	<b>Competent:</b> Competent evaluation of team work. Competent understanding of agile methodologies, showing competent ability to apply concepts and principles learnt in the module to the specific team situation.
4	<b>Acceptable:</b> Acceptable evaluation of team work. Some understanding of agile methodologies.
0-3	<b>Inadequate:</b> Very little or no evaluation of team work. Very little or no understanding of agile methodologies. Some questions were not answered.

#### Time Expenditure [weight 6]

Marks	Description
8-10	<b>Excellent:</b> Excellent evaluation of time management. Clear evidence of reflection and introspection.
7	<b>Very Good:</b> Very good evaluation of time management.
6	<b>Good:</b> Good evaluation of time management.
5	<b>Competent:</b> Competent evaluation of time management.
4	<b>Acceptable:</b> Acceptable evaluation of time management.
0-3	<b>Inadequate:</b> Very little or no evaluation of time management.

#### Tools and Communication [weight 3]

Marks	Description
8-10	<b>Excellent:</b> Excellent evaluation of tools and communication strategies. Clear evidence of reflection and introspection.

7	<b>Very Good:</b> Very good evaluation of tools and communication strategies.
6	<b>Good:</b> Good evaluation of tools and communication strategies.
5	<b>Competent:</b> Competent evaluation of tools and communication strategies.
4	<b>Acceptable:</b> Acceptable evaluation of tools and communication strategies.
0-3	<b>Inadequate:</b> Very little or no evaluation of tools and communication strategies.

### Advice to Next Year's Students [weight 4]

Marks	Description
8-10	<b>Excellent:</b> Evidence of excellent understanding, insight and reflection.
7	<b>Very Good:</b> Evidence of very good understanding, insight and reflection.
6	<b>Good:</b> Evidence of good understanding, insight and basic reflection.
5	<b>Competent:</b> Evidence of competent understanding and insight.
4	<b>Acceptable:</b> Evidence of acceptable understanding and insight.
0-3	<b>Inadequate:</b> Very little or no evidence of understanding and insight.

### Presentation [weight 1]

Note: students should not be penalised for incorrect use of grammar or spelling, unless this significantly affects the clarity of their argument.

Marks	Description
1	The student's arguments are presented clearly and succinctly across all sections.
0	The student's arguments are not presented clearly and succinctly in at least one of the sections.

## Generic Assessment Descriptors:

Extracts from the University standard assessment descriptors are given below.

Excellent (80-100%)	Very high degree of technical and practical competence in using software. Very high degree of competence in applying concepts & principles & methods outside the area in which they were studied. Very high degree of competence in communicating accurately and reliably, contextualising knowledge and structuring/sustaining arguments. Presentation is crisp, uncluttered, sophisticated and in an appropriate format.
Very Good (70-79%)	High degree of technical and practical competence in using software. High degree of competence in applying concepts & principles & methods outside the area in which they were studied. High degree of competence in communicating accurately and reliably, contextualising knowledge and structuring arguments. Presentation is crisp, uncluttered, sophisticated and in an appropriate format.
Good (60-69%)	Good technical and practical competence in using software. Good at applying concepts & principles & methods outside the area in which they were studied. Good at communicating accurately, reliably, and structuring arguments. Presentation is highly competent and in an appropriate format.
Competent (50-59%)	Sound technical and practical competence in using software. Competent ability to apply concepts & principles & methods outside the area in which they were studied. Competent ability to communicate and structure arguments, knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts; reliance upon description as a substitute for analysis. Presentation is competent and in generally in an appropriate format.
Acceptable (40-49%)	Acceptable technical and practical competence in using software. Acceptable ability to apply concepts & principles & methods outside the area in which they were studied. Acceptable ability to communicate and structure arguments, knowledge of subject and its underlying concepts. Presentation is satisfactory and in generally in an appropriate format, although deficiencies are apparent.
Borderline (25-39%)	Some technical and practical competence in using software. Some ability to apply concepts & principles & methods outside the area in which they were studied. Some ability to communicate accurately, reliably, and structure arguments. Presentation is acceptable, although deficiencies are apparent, but may be in an inappropriate format.
Inadequate (0-24%)	Very little technical and practical competence in using software. Inadequate ability to apply concepts & principles & methods outside the area in which they were studied. Inadequate ability to communicate accurately, reliably, and structure arguments. Presentation is very poor and in an inappropriate format.

### **Group meeting conduct & professionalism**

5% of your mark for this component comes from your supervisor's assessment of your team's performance in ALL of the supervisor meetings throughout the semester. The criteria for this component is as follows:

**Excellent-** Always punctual, good use of time, slick presentations, professional manner, excellent group cohesion

**Good-** Very punctual, mostly good use of time, organised presentation, good group cohesion

**Satisfactory-** Mostly punctual, sometimes disorganised, evidence of group cohesion

**Borderline-** Sometimes late, evidence of disorganisation, evidence of poor group cohesion, sometimes lacking professionalism

**Inadequate-** Late, disorganised, unprepared, poor group cohesion, unprofessional, chaotic