Grading Rubric

	H1	H2.1	H2.2	Pass	Fail
Communication (10%)	The presentation comprehensively outlined the project. The speaker was poised and enthusiastic. Questions were excellently answered.	The presentation outlined the project in detail. The speaker was poised and enthusiastic. Questions were very well answered.	The presentation outlined the project. The speaker was poised and enthusiastic. Questions were answered.	The presentation somewhat outlined the project. The speaker was poised and enthusiastic. Questions were reasonably well answered.	The presentation is unorganized and unclear. Questions were unanswered/poorly answered.
Final Technical Report (20%)	The report is written in a formal academic style using the template provided on Moodle; with very clear statements and conclusions highlighting the development process. Proper Harvard Referencing Style (HRS) throughout. Excellent statements and clear presentation of requirements migration. Excellent use of illustrations, code samples, etc.	The report is written in a formal academic style using the template provided on Moodle with clear statements and conclusions, and use of proper HRS; Very good statements and clear presentation of achievements.	The report is written in a formal academic style but missing in conclusions and discussions not perfect. Inappropriate referencing strategy followed. Good statements and clear presentation of achievements.	The report is not well structured and does not use proper academic style or follow the template provided on Moodle; there are no references supporting the development of the project. There is a lack of clarity and less effective use of illustrations, code samples, etc. Conclusions are not clearly supported by the development process.	The report is poorly written, and the statements are unclear and lacks conclusions and discussions and proper referencing style (HRS). Grossly inaccurate or incomplete presentation and statement of results. Lack of clarity and usage illustrations, code samples, etc. Conclusions are not supported by results.
Complexity / Coding Skills (10%)	A project that addresses complex issues, using sophisticated software development.	A project that partially addresses some complex issues.	Wide scopes of issues are addressed, but the implementation lacks depth.	A project that does not implement effectively or bypasses some of the more difficult aspects of the proposal.	A project with very little innovative software development.

Technology (20%)	Exploits leading edge features of new or emerging technologies or exploits fully chosen technologies possible appropriate to the application.	A project that uses complex or difficult features of technology appropriately. Exploits many features of the chosen technology.	A project that uses less complex technology to a high standard or integrates several technologies.	The project uses standard technologies with little innovation	The project uses a standard technology in a very basic and rudimentary manner.
Innovation (10%)	An innovative solution based on research to produce a viable software tool.	An innovative concept or a novel extension of existing software applications.	An idea that merges ideas from several existing sources	A project with limited functionality but with some innovative features	A project that reproduces, without extension, ideas of existing sources.
Completeness (10%)	Project is close to commercial/ public implementation.	Project is excellent but would need more work to attain commercial/ public implementation.	Project demonstrates a good deal of work by the learner, but where the project contains few innovative features.	Functionality is partly complete or obvious extensions are not implemented.	The learner does not understand aspects of the functionality or the implementation.
Testing/ Evaluation (10%)	End user testing/ Evidence of Evaluation/ System testing	Demonstration of System testing.	Demonstration of testing a main component of the solution.	Demonstration of testing part of a main component of the solution.	No evidence of testing or evaluation.
Project Management (10%)	Clear, concise, and detailed project planning throughout the life of the project. Reference to document trail for revisions to the project scope. Evidence of contingency plans activated in response to pre-planned triggers. Response to scope changes demonstrated clear prioritization of project goals.	Good evidence of planning, management of risks and reporting procedures, with a nearly complete document trail and evidence of contingency planning and prioritization. Outcome of project is close to planned outcome	Documentary evidence of realistic and useful planning and continuous monitoring and reporting risks and changes to project scope. Limited prioritization and use of contingency planning in responding to issues and problems affecting the scope of the project.	Brief Commentary on management process but limited references to documentation trail evidencing project planning, management of risks or management and reporting changes to project scope.	No documentary evidence that project was subject to any serious planning, management of risks or management and reporting of changes to project.