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# MARKING SCHEME

## Task 1 (Element 010-1) Weekly Journal – Learning Outcomes 2, 4, 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **<40**  **Inadequate** | **40-49**  **Adequate** | **50-59**  **Sound** | **60-69**  **Good** | **70+**  **Excellent** |
| **LO2 – Working as part of a team (30%)** | Journal entries do not show communication with other team members and indicate actions which may be detrimental to the team. | Journal entries show adequate two-way communication with other team members. | Entries show sound consideration of and communication with other team members. | Entries show good consideration/ communication, and some reflection on how their actions affect the team. | Journal entries show excellent consideration/ communication, and detailed reflection on how their actions affect the team. |
| **LO4 – Contribute to the solution/product (30%)** | Entries show little if any technical contributions to the project, or contributions which do not function. | Entries show adequate (more than one) technical contributions to the project. | Entries show consistent technical contributions to the project. | Entries show consistent and significant technical contributions to the project. | Entries show consistent and significant technical contributions to the project with area ownership. |
| **LO5 – Understand the roles and needs of the team to make it a success (30%)** | Journal entries show no understanding of what other team members are doing or need. | Journal entries show adequate understanding of what other team members are doing. | Journal entries show sound understanding of what other team members are doing and why. | Journal entries show good understanding of what other team members are doing or need, and why. | Journal entries show excellent understanding of what other team members are doing or need, and why that impacts the project. |
| **Engagement - Consistency and Evidence (10%)** | Journal entries less than every other week with no evidence of technical contributions. Little or no reflection on the project. | Journal entries most weeks with some evidence of technical contributions and a basic reflection on project progress. | Journal entries most weeks with some evidence of technical contributions and reflections on successes or challenges. | Journal entries every week with evidence for all contributions and reflections on successes and challenges. | Journal entries every week with evidence of all contributions, updates project progress, and considered reflections on successes and challenges. |

## Task 2 (Element 010-2) Report – Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6

|  | **<40**  **Inadequate** | **40-49**  **Adequate** | **50-59**  **Sound** | **60-69**  **Good** | **70+**  **Excellent** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LO1 – PROJECT PLANNING – Establish aims, objectives, timeframes (30%)** | None or inadequate understanding of project planning considerations with few if any tasks identified and no concern around timescales. | Adequate understanding of project planning considerations and identifying some tasks. Timescales attempted but generally inaccurate. | Sound understanding of project planning considerations calling on some industry standard processes and identifying some tasks. Timescales attempted but can be inaccurate. | Good understanding of project planning considerations calling on industry standard processes and identifying tasks and generally accurate timescales. | Excellent understanding of project planning considerations calling on industry standard processes and identifying tasks and accurate timescales. |
| **LO2 – IMPLEMENTATION – Working as part of a Team (10%)** | Inadequate evidence of contributions to the smooth running of the project or evidence of being detrimental to the team. | Adequate evidence of contributions to the smooth running of the project and team such as task completion communication. | Sound evidence of contributions to the smooth running of the project and team such as **task** ownership and communication. | Good evidence of contributions to the smooth running of the project and team such as **area** ownership and communication. | Excellent evidence of contributions to the smooth running of the project and team such as leadership, ownership and communication. |
| **LO4 – IMPLEMENTATION – Contribute to the solution/product (10%)** | Entries show little if any technical contributions to the project, or contributions which do not function. | Entries show adequate (more than one) technical contributions to the project. | Entries show consistent technical contributions to the project. | Entries show consistent and significant technical contributions to the project. | Entries show consistent and significant technical contributions to the project with area ownership. |
| **LO5 – EVALUATION – Understand the roles and needs of the team to make it a success (20%)** | Little to no understanding shown of the roles of other team members or processes followed. | Adequate understanding shown of the roles of other team members and processes followed. | Sound understanding shown of the roles of other team members and processes followed, including some discussion of how they affect the project. | Good understanding shown of the roles of other team members and processes followed, including in depth discussion of how they affect the project. | Excellent understanding shown of the roles of other team members and how their performance and processes affect the project. |
| **LO6 – EVALUATION – Appropriate recommendations based on conclusions and evidence (20%)** | Little to no evaluation of the product. Few or no appropriate recommendations, or recommendations drawn from nothing. | Adequate evaluation of product against the spec only. Some appropriate recommendations for improvement. | Sound evaluation of product against the spec only. All points converted into appropriate recommendations. | Good evaluation of product against the spec and project plan. Some points converted into appropriate recommendations. | Excellent evaluation of product against the spec and project plan. All points evaluated then converted into appropriate recommendations. |
| **Academic Writing and References**  **(10%)** | Not written in academic writing style. No references or inappropriate references. | Attempted academic writing style and referencing, with a lot of errors. | Attempted academic writing style and referencing, with few errors. | Fully written in academic writing style with appropriate referencing in the correct style. | Fully written in academic writing style with excellent referencing and quantity of references. |

## Task 3 (Element 010-3) Presentation to Client – Learning Outcomes 3, 6

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **<40**  **Inadequate** | **40-49**  **Adequate** | **50-59**  **Sound** | **60-69**  **Good** | **70+**  **Excellent** |
| **LO3 – Produce a working prototype (50%)** | Prototype is does not function and does not meet minimum spec. No understanding shown by of the intended product usage.  **OR**  Exceedingly little evidence of student contributing to the project. | Prototype is generally functional and meets or is close to meeting minimum spec. Adequate understanding shown of the intended product usage.  **OR**  Minimal evidence of student contribution to the project. | Prototype is generally functional and meets minimum spec. Sound understanding shown of the intended product usage. | Prototype is fully functional and meets minimum spec. Good understanding shown of the intended product usage and tech behind it on areas developed themselves. | Prototype is fully functional and exceeds minimum spec. Excellent understanding shown of the intended product usage and tech behind it even on areas not developed themselves. |
| **LO6 – Present and communicate appropriately (50%)** | Unprofessional presentation style or unclear. No or little consideration of client knowledge. Barely speaking or the only person speaking. | Presentation in a generally professional manner with attempted consideration of client knowledge levels. May speak less or more than appropriate vs other team members. | Presentation in a professional manner with attempted consideration of client knowledge levels. May speak slightly less or more than appropriate vs other team members. Acknowledges feedback provided by the client during the process of demonstration. | Clear presentation in a professional manner with consideration of client knowledge levels. Good balance of speaking vs letting the other team members speak. Addresses any feedback provided by the client during the process of demonstration. | Clear, confident presentation in a professional manner with consideration of client knowledge levels. Excellent balance of speaking vs letting the other team members speak. Thoroughly addresses any feedback provided by the client during the process of demonstration. |