

Part 1 : Analysis and Design Artifacts				Grade:		
Criteria	HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required	D Good Reflects a mastery of what is required	C Expected Basic understanding and delivery of what is required	P Basic Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	N Unacceptable Fails to identify what is required	Comments
Section A: Iteration Analysis and Design						
	Demonstration of analysis skills at an exceptional level, showing critical thinking, originality and integration of all concepts. AND Shows deep understanding of what is required. AND Problem statement / opportunity stated shows an exceptional analysis / research conducted. AND Exceptional understanding of the target audience with needs recognised within the iteration requirements. AND Current iteration addresses the current problem / opportunity states AND Current iteration, descriptions, intent and audience needs identified are all clearly demonstrated in the BUILD. (BUILD matches this analysis). AND Any changes in priorities from the previous build plan are detailed meaningfully which are inline with further analysis completed. AND Any risks identified through the studio or with the mentor are detailed AND All other linked analysis artifacts all reflect the exceptional analysis detailed in the report. AND Obviously that has been written before build begins with updates according to further analysis/ research completed.	Demonstration of analysis skills at a superior level, showing critical thinking, originality and integration of all concepts. AND Shows superior understanding of what is required. AND Problem statement / opportunity stated shows a superior analysis / research conducted. AND Target audience' needs recognized within the iteration requirements . AND Current iteration adds value to the overall build plan, i.e. descriptions are more meaningful but not enough. AND Current iteration, descriptions, intent and audience needs identified are demonstrated in the BUILD. (BUILD matches this analysis). AND Any changes in priorities from the previous build plan may not be detailed but are described in updated builds that they will appear in. AND Most new risks (identified through the studio review) are detailed AND Most other linked analysis artifacts reflect the exceptional analysis detailed in the report. AND Obvious that has been written to inform the build	Proficient level of analysis showing critical thinking, originality and integration of all concepts. AND Shows proficient understanding of what is required. AND Problem statement / opportunity stated shows a good analysis / research conducted. AND Target audience' needs recognized within the iteration requirements . AND Current iteration shows an understanding of requirements AND Current iteration, descriptions, intent and audience needs identified are demonstrated in the BUILD. (BUILD matches this analysis). AND Changes and risks are mentioned (in the studio review) but not defined here or do not match exactly what has been discussed AND Some of the other linked analysis artifacts reflect the exceptional analysis detailed in the report. AND Has been written to inform the build, but possibly at the same time	Satisfactory level of analysis/ critical thinking demonstrated. AND Shows a basic understanding of what is required AND A basic problem statement / opportunity stated. AND Basic target audience' needs recognised. AND Current iteration descriptions that are provided at a basic level. AND Current iteration, descriptions, intent and audience needs are sufficiently stated. OR Most components of the build match the analysis. OR Changes or risks (assuming there are some) mentioned are at a basic level or some are incorrect OR Additional artefacts has been made but provide little help help with the development OR Written to inform the build, but as an afterthought, as the build is being created, so the build is informing the description	Lack of satisfactory demonstration of analysis skills with a low level of analysis or critical thinking OR Shows a little to no understanding of what is required OR Problem statement / opportunity description is incomplete or vague, and/or not sufficient OR Analysis is of no relevance to the system, shows no understanding of system OR Descriptions are missing, unclear, and incomplete OR Analysis of audience requirements is incomplete or incorrect. OR Descriptions does not match the actual BUILD out of this iteration OR Changes/risks are incorrect or ignored OR Additional artefacts has been made has been made but irrelevant to the build OR A description of what was built, was completed after the build was done.	
Analysis & Design Quality						
	Professional well structured report AND Lean with no additional irrelevant information or gaff AND Appendices containing ONLY relevant feedback from IM's or potential changes, all links within the report are easy to reference by mentor AND Include all required components including LINK to their build AND Strictly following the team's own formatting guidelines for layout (headings), spacing, alignment, headings, etc. AND format and layout make the report professional, drawing attention to the content, and enhancing readability. AND Appropriate Business English used at all times in the document. AND Target audience of the report is well understood.	Professional well structured report AND Lean but with irrelevant information are included AND Appendices containing feedback from IM's or potential changes Links within the report are easy to reference by mentor AND Include all required components including LINK to their build AND following the team's own formatting guidelines for layout (headings), spacing, alignment, headings, etc. AND format and layout make the report professional, drawing attention to the content, and enhancing readability. AND Appropriate Business English used at all times in the document with minor grammatical errors AND Target audience of the report is well understood	Professional well structured report but with minor mistakes AND Generally Lean report but with irrelevant information included AND Appendices contains feedback from IM and Links and are accessible AND Include all required components including LINK to their build AND Loosely following the team's own formatting guidelines for layout (headings), spacing, alignment, headings, etc. AND Some thoughts have been put into layout and formatting but still contain inconsistencies. AND Appropriate Business English used most times in the document with some grammatical errors AND Basic understanding of the target audience of the report.	Basic structured report OR Report contains some irrelevant information OR Appendices only contain either the IM feedback or links.but with some errors / non-accessible links OR contains some poorly written components, includes LINK to their build OR Inconsistent, non-professional formatting, as if no thought has been put into proper formatting / styling of the document OR Little thought has been put into layout and formatting but still contain inconsistencies. OR English used all times in the document with major grammatical errors throughout OR Little understanding of the target audience of the report.	Unprofessional structure OR Information included is generally irrelevant to the project, absolutely not lean. OR Appendices poorly written OR Poorly written, shows that no thoughts have been put into writing the report OR Missing parts/components or no link OR Inconsistent, non-professional formatting, as if no thought has been put into proper formatting/styling of the document OR No thoughts have been put into layout and formatting but still contain inconsistencies. OR English used all times in the document but with major grammatical errors throughout	
Report Presentation / Format						
Section B: Epics and User Stories (Leankit)						

	Shows exceptional analysis and evaluation of what is required in determining the successful implementation of each component. AND Matches system / the build AND User stories are meaningful and aligned to the problem / opportunity defined. AND complete with acceptance criteria that shows a complete and thorough understanding of the iteration build. AND Build is complete exactly as per acceptance criteria	Shows Superior analysis and evaluation of what is required in determining the successful implementation of each component AND Matches system AND User stories are meaningful and aligned to the problem / opportunity defined with minor errors / lack of clarity AND complete with acceptance criteria that shows an understanding of the iteration build. AND Build is complete as per acceptance criteria	Proficient analysis / critical evaluation of what is required AND Matches system AND Minor errors to user stories / written unclearly. Descriptions appropriate and precise. AND Acceptance criteria has been written well but not specific enough, or missing some parts. AND Shows some thought of what is required in determining the successful implementation of each component	Satisfactory analysis of what is required AND Matches the system with some minor differences OR Does not reflect fulfilling the basic requirements OR Acceptance criteria are a little inaccurate and non-comprehensive. OR Criteria is a little difficult to use OR Shows very little (but some) thought of what is required in determining the successful implementation of each component	Low level of analysis completed to determine what required OR Does not match system being accepted OR Descriptions are completely inappropriate for requirements. Entries are incomplete or vague, OR acceptance criteria are not sufficient / not notated / or are vague, does not exist or is unusable by mentors OR Shows no understanding of requirements
Epics/User Stories					
	Format is easy to use for intended audience (Team & mentors) AND Kept up to date by all members AND demonstrates an exceptional understanding of how to use this tool to manage the team and project.	Format is easy to use for intended audience (Team & mentors) AND Kept up to date by most team members AND demonstrates a superior understanding of how to use this tool to manage the team and project.	Format is at a usable for attended audience AND Frequently updated by some team members AND demonstrates a proficient understanding of how to use this tool to manage the team and project.	Format is slightly unclear, and not easy to use OR Not kept up to date as often updated by all team members OR demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of how to use this tool to manage the team and project.	Poor formatting and mostly unclear entries OR Not used or not kept up to date by any team members (updated only at point of iteration submission) OR does not demonstrate understanding of how to use this tool to manage the team and project.
Format / Updates					
Section C: Project Governance					
	Exhibiting an exceptional understanding of their target audience through persona definitions. AND Focuses on major needs and expectation of the target audience AND Describes real people with backgrounds, goals, values	Exhibiting an superior understanding of their target audience through persona definitions. AND Identified major needs and expectation AND Mostly describes real people with backgrounds, goals, values	Exhibiting a proficient understanding of their target audience through persona definitions. AND Identified major needs and expectation AND Mostly describes real people with backgrounds, goals, values	Doesn't exhibit an acceptable understanding of their target audience through persona definitions. OR Does not identify needs and expectation OR Mostly describes real people with backgrounds, goals, values	Unsatisfactory amount of research demonstrated. OR Users badly described, OR Needs / expectations are vague OR Little to no goals, values
Personas					
	Defined well / meaningfully. No missing data. AND Shows thoughtful analysis and critical evaluation of what is required in determining the requirements in order for the system to work now and in the future AND Organised and logical, obvious understanding of how and why the requirements are needed	All requirements met AND Shows some analysis and critical evaluation of what is required in order for the system to work now and in the future AND Organised and logical, obvious understanding of how and why the requirements are needed,	Most requirements met but if not there, an explanation why AND Shows thought of what is required in order for the system to work now and in the future AND Mostly Organised and logical, shows understanding of how and why the requirements are needed.	Entries are incomplete or vague, and/or incorrect. OR Shows very little (but some) thought of what is required in order for the system to work now and in the future	Shows no understanding of what is required and why? OR Unable to use these details in order for the system to work now and in the future
Open Data Details					
	Exceptional knowledge of their project showing a clear understanding of specific and relevant risks if any required. AND Clear achievable mitigation strategy AND No irrelevant general risks.	Superior knowledge of their project showing a clear understanding of specific and relevant risks if any required. AND Mostly clear achievable mitigation strategy AND NO irrelevant general risks.	Proficient knowledge of their project showing an understanding of specific and relevant risks if any required. AND Provided generic mitigation strategy AND Some irrelevant general risks.	Sufficient knowledge of their project showing a general understanding of specific and relevant risks if any required. OR Unclear, high-level mitigation strategy OR Almost all irrelevant general risks.	Lacking knowledge of their project, not showing an understanding of specific and relevant risks if any required. OR no mitigation strategy listed OR Completely irrelevant risks to the project listed
Risks (if any required)					
	Exceptional knowledge of their project showing a clear understanding of project specific and relevant security vulnerabilities if any. AND Clear achievable mitigation strategy AND No relevant general security vulnerabilities mentioned	Superior knowledge of their project showing a clear understanding of specific and relevant security vulnerabilities if any required. AND Mostly clear achievable mitigation strategy AND Some irrelevant general security vulnerabilities.	Proficient knowledge of their project showing an understanding of specific and relevant security vulnerabilities if any required. AND Provided generic mitigation strategy AND Mostly irrelevant general security vulnerabilities.	Sufficient knowledge of their project showing a general understanding of specific and relevant security vulnerabilities if any required. OR Unclear, high-level mitigation strategy OR Almost all irrelevant general security vulnerabilities.	Lacking knowledge of their project, not showing an understanding of specific and relevant security vulnerabilities if any required. OR no mitigation strategy listed OR security vulnerabilities listed irrelevant to the project.
Security Aspects					
	Clearly testing has been used to inform the build AND No team input to actual testing, unless asking why the tester did certain things in certain ways AND Multiple testing videos have been done with the feedback from each applied to the next video test.	Testing has been used to inform the final build AND No team input to actual testing, unless asking why the tester did certain things in certain ways AND Multiple testing videos have been done with the feedback applied to next iteration user stories.	Testing has been done when final version of build has finished AND Team members directed the testing when testers are stuck/confused. AND Testing video feedback applied to next iteration user stories.	Testing has been done when final version of build has finished OR Team members directed most of the testing process OR Testing video feedback has not been applied to next iteration user stories.	Testing has been done by team member OR Video can't be opened OR No feedback has been mentioned by tester No sound
Usability Testing Video					

	Information stated in a meaningful and insightful way, shows thorough and insightful understanding of why this section is here and is written accordingly AND All of the testing methods have been listed down as a summary, with all details included. AND testing described is evident in the build	Information stated in a meaningful and insightful way, shows understanding of why this section is here and is written AND All of the testing methods have been listed down as a summary, with most details included. AND testing described is evident in the build	Information stated is adequate and meaningful. AND Shows some thought given to what is tested and how it will be used. AND testing described is evident in the build	Basic testing detailed OR Some of the testing methods have been listed down as a summary, with some missing details. OR testing described is not all evident in the build	Not adequate, or is incorrect. OR The section description does not assist in giving any idea about what kinds of testing were carried out and by whom OR build show little to no evidence of any meaningful testing	
Testing Details						
Other Analysis and Design Artifacts	All design artifacts listed clearly aid the development process and not merely done to 'waffle'	All design artifacts listed clearly aid the development process and not merely done to 'waffle'	All design artifacts listed clearly aid the development process and not merely done to 'waffle'		None of lists artifacts assist in development OR Contains lots of useless "waffle"	
Only of value marks deducted if no purpose	AND demonstrate exceptional understanding of processes / artifacts that assist development.	AND demonstrate superior understanding of processes / artifacts that assist development.	AND demonstrate some understanding of processes / artifacts that assist development.	Listed artifact may assist with the development while other do not		
	Professional well structured with well-written English AND Information presented in a logical flow, making it easy to navigate AND Include all required components AND Strictly follows the team's own formatting guidelines for layout (headings), spacing, alignment, headings, etc. AND Consistent formatting, sizing and styling throughout the different sections or pages. AND Appropriate Business English used at all times in the pages AND Constantly updated depending on the progress of the project, not only during iteration submission time.	Professional well structured with well-written English AND Information presented in a logical flow, making it easy to navigate AND Include all required components AND Mostly follows the team's own formatting guidelines for layout (headings), spacing, alignment, headings, etc. AND Consistent formatting, sizing and styling throughout the different sections or pages. AND Appropriate Business English used at most times in the pages AND Regularly updated depending on the progress of the project, not only during iteration submission time.	Professional well structured with well-written English AND All information are presented in a rather logical flow AND Include all required components AND Shows effort of adhering to the team's own formatting. AND Consistent formatting, sizing and styling throughout the different sections or pages. AND Appropriate Business English used at most times in the pages, but with minor errors AND Mostly updated as the development process evolved.	Basic English is used throughout the pages OR does not have a logical flow OR Some minor components are missing OR Very little thought put into formatting or styling OR Some grammatical errors in different parts of the page OR Only updated during submission time, treats mahara as a submission platform rather than an ePortfolio	Poor English is used OR does not have a logical flow OR Some information are missing, OR No thought put into formatting or styling OR Each section has a different style. OR Grammatical errors in different parts of the page OR Lacking required elements OR only updated during submission time. Treats mahara as a submission platform rather than an ePortfolio	
Industry Mentor Mahara Presentation / Layout / Management / Content						
Part 2 : The Build						Grade:
	HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required	D Good Reflects a mastery of what is required	C Expected Basic understanding and delivery of what is required	P Basic Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	N Unacceptable Fails to identify what is required	
Criteria						
Build Quality	Shows exceptional analysis / critical thinking as this build adds value and addresses problems / opportunities stated for the specific target audience defined. AND Feedback from build reviews obvious. AND System is well-designed, accurately reflect requirements	Shows superior analysis / critical thinking as this build adds value and addresses problems / opportunities stated for the specific target audience defined. AND Feedback from build reviews mostly adapted AND System is well designed, does reflects requirements	Shows proficient analysis / critical thinking as this build adds value and addresses problems / opportunities stated for the specific target audience defined. AND Some feedback from build reviews applied AND System show reasonably good design but need more thought and work, AND The program produces correct results but does not display them correctly AND Does not entirely conform to accepted development standards**, but is close AND System does produce expected outcomes but still could have been organised better AND Size of functionality is as expected for that build	Shows satisfactory analysis / critical thinking and addresses problems / opportunities stated for the specific target audience defined. AND Very little feedback from build reviews applied AND System is there but poorly-designed, Many requirements missed or not accurately reflected AND The program produces correct results in some cases, does not display them correctly or crashes in some instances AND Does not conform very well to accepted development standards** AND Functionality taken out of build; hardly any functionality delivered, due to insufficient effort AND Size of functionality barely sufficient for that build	Lacking analysis / critical thinking and does not address problems / opportunities stated for the specific target audience defined. AND No feedback have been applied AND Inconsistent, Requirements missed or represented very poorly, Team has significant misconceptions. AND The program is producing incorrect results or crashes AND Does not adhere to development standards** AND Functionality very limited due to lack of effort AND Size of functionality is less than expected	
Easy to use/ Layout is clear and intuitive; one can always find what they need It is easy to navigate through the information to find necessary features Layout is consistent and logical on all pages No unnecessary features such as customer id, if not needed Date format appropriate Colours/fonts/ text layout appropriate						

Data Use	<p>Creative and obvious understanding of hindsight, insight and foresight and used to improve the use and value of the application</p> <p>Techniques used to depend on student strength and project</p> <p>Meaningful: interpreting and showing the results so they are easy-to-understand by the audience/stakeholder</p> <p>Shows insightful understanding of what will be useful and appropriate</p> <p>Shows critical reasoning why this data/ model would be useful for this audience/project</p> <p>Used the appropriate techniques/skill for the job</p> <p>Obvious checking of results to ensure correctness and validity</p> <p>Documents conclusions/models in well enough that others (other team members or other (future) data scientists) to understand and knows why</p>	<p>Obvious understanding of hindsight, insight and foresight and used to improve the use and value of the application</p> <p>Techniques used to depend on student strength and project</p> <p>Meaningful: interpreting and showing the results so they are easy-to-understand by the audience/stakeholder</p> <p>Shows understanding of what will be useful and appropriate</p> <p>Shows reasoning why this data/ model would be useful for this audience/project</p> <p>Mostly used the appropriate techniques/skill for the job</p> <p>Obvious checking of results to ensure correctness and validity</p> <p>Documents conclusions/models quite well for others (other team members or other (future) data scientists) to understand and know why</p>	<p>Realises what hindsight, insight and foresight mean but has not necessarily considered them in this project</p> <p>Techniques used to depend on student strength and project</p> <p>Mostly meaningful: interpreting and showing the results so they are easy-to-understand by the audience/stakeholder.</p> <p>Shows some understanding of what will be useful and appropriate</p> <p>Shows some reasoning why this data/ model would be useful for this audience/project</p> <p>Used known techniques/skill for the job, but not always appropriate</p> <p>Obvious checking of results to ensure correctness and validity</p> <p>Documents conclusions/models adequately for others (other team members or other (future) data scientists) to understand and know why</p>	<p>Understands some of the meaning of hindsight, insight and foresight, but has not considered any.</p> <p>Techniques used to depend on student strength and project</p> <p>Lots of technique used but not meaningful to the audience. Adds no value but they do interpret results.</p> <p>Shows little understanding of what will be useful and appropriate</p> <p>Shows little reasoning why this data/ model would be useful for this audience/project</p> <p>Used techniques/skill for the job without any thinking- they were just skills that they had</p> <p>Little checking of results to ensure correctness and validity</p> <p>Documents conclusions/models without much thought as to why and how they might be used.</p>	<p>Does not know the value of hindsight, insight and foresight</p> <p>Techniques used to depend on student strength and project</p> <p>Techniques not used in any way.</p> <p>Shows no understanding of what will be useful and appropriate</p> <p>Shows no reasoning why this data/ model would be useful for this audience/project</p> <p>Used no techniques/skill for the job</p> <p>No checking of results to ensure correctness and validity</p> <p>No Documentation of conclusions/models</p>	
Data Management	<p>Well thought out and planned, Critical thinking obvious in changes needed from further analysis</p> <p>Accurate and comprehensive and clearly focused, organised and logical. matches needs</p> <p>Shows a very strong grasp of techniques</p> <p>ALL data used ties back to the design and analysis artifacts</p>	<p>Shows some level of critical thinking and is well organised and logical</p> <p>appropriate, accurate and comprehensive –</p> <p>Shows a good grasp of techniques</p> <p>ALL data used ties back to the design and analysis artifacts</p>	<p>No critical thinking or analysis obvious. Reflects fulfilling the expected requirement and shows development and movement toward a better submission.</p> <p>could be more appropriate and/or need a bit more precision</p> <p>Shows understanding of technique</p> <p>ALL data used ties back to the design and analysis artifacts</p>	<p>Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required. not quite appropriate</p> <p>a little inaccurate and non- comprehensive – need a lot more precision</p> <p>Shows difficulty using techniques</p>	<p>completely inappropriate</p> <p>inaccurate or missing completely – lack precision</p> <p>Shows no grasp of techniques</p>	
Data Modelling	<p>Well thought out and planned,</p> <p>Accurate and comprehensive and clearly focused, organised and logical, matches organisation needs</p> <p>Shows a very strong grasp of techniques</p>	<p>Shows some level of critical thinking and is well organised and logical</p> <p>Models used are appropriate, accurate and comprehensive –</p> <p>Shows a good grasp of techniques</p>	<p>No critical thinking or analysis obvious. Reflects fulfilling the expected requirement and shows development and movement toward a better submission.</p> <p>Models used could be more appropriate and need a bit more precision</p> <p>Shows understanding of technique</p>	<p>Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required.</p> <p>Models used are not quite appropriate and are a little inaccurate and non- comprehensive – need a lot more precision</p>	<p>Models are completely inappropriate</p> <p>Models do not conform to accepted modelling standards No attempts made at internal consistency in models</p> <p>Shows no grasp of techniques</p>	
System Codes	<p>Readability - The code is exceptionally well organized and very easy to follow.</p> <p>Reusability The code routines are reused or will be.</p> <p>Documentation is well commented and clearly explains what and how it is accomplishing and is easily able to be maintained</p> <p>Efficiency The code is extremely efficient without sacrificing readability and understanding.</p>	<p>The code is well organized and easy to follow.</p> <p>The code could be reused as a whole or each routine could be reused</p> <p>The documentation is quite well written and explains what the code is accomplishing and how. With thought, could be easily maintained.</p> <p>The code is quite efficient and structured well without sacrificing readability and understanding.</p>	<p>The code is fairly easy to read.</p> <p>Most of the code could be reused in other programs.</p> <p>The documentation consists of embedded comment and some simple header documentation that is somewhat useful in understanding the code.</p> <p>The code is efficient and understandable but could be better structured.</p>	<p>The code is readable only by someone who knows what it is supposed to be doing.</p> <p>Some parts of the code could be reused in other programs</p> <p>Only a few comments embedded in the code with some simple header comments separating routines</p> <p>The code lacks structure and is hard to read and understand</p>	<p>The code is poorly organized and very difficult to read</p> <p>The code is not organized for reusability.</p> <p>There is no documentation</p> <p>The code is huge and appears to be patched together.</p>	Cannot review as no access was provided.
Part 3 : Retrospective Artifacts						
Grade:						
Criteria	HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required	D Good Reflects a mastery of what is required	C Expected Basic understanding and delivery of what is required	P Basic Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	N Unacceptable Fails to identify what is required	
Contents	<p>Exceptionally well thought out and planned,</p> <p>Critical thinking obvious in changes needed accurate and comprehensive and clearly focused, organised and logical.</p> <p>Shows profound understanding of retrospectives and the reasoning behind them</p>	<p>Quite well thought out and planned,</p> <p>Some thought obvious in changes needed accurate and comprehensive and clearly focused, organised and logical.</p> <p>Shows understanding of retrospectives and the reasoning behind them</p>	<p>Planned and thought about adequately,</p> <p>Understanding changes needed accurate and comprehensive and clearly focused, easy to understand</p> <p>Shows understanding of reasons for retrospectives</p>	<p>each of the required areas of a retrospective defined,</p> <p>Changes needed are accurate and necessary</p> <p>Shows some understanding of retrospectives and the reasoning behind them</p>	<p>seems that there is no idea what a retrospective is, accurate and necessary</p> <p>No idea about what should be the content of a retrospective notes meaningless or nonexistent.</p>	
Part 4 : Iteration Reviews						
Grade:						
Overall Grade						

					Overall Mark	
--	--	--	--	--	--------------	--