

Component		Fail 0 – 39%	Pass 40 – 49%	Clear Pass 50-59%	Good Pass 60-69%	Excellent 70-79%	Outstanding 80%+
Project and Team Management (20)							
Team effectiveness <i>(evidenced via e.g. group agreements, meeting logs)</i>	5	No evidence of group working agreement or meeting logs.	Evidence of agreed group working agreement Contemporaneous evidence of several stand-up meetings / scrums to discuss progress between planning sessions across project.	As Pass, plus:- Evidence of at least one role rotation cycle. Evidence of skills reflection from team members Evidence of regular participation from team, and equitable team involvement	As Clear Pass, plus: Evidence of semi-regular role rotation Contemporaneous evidence of regular, stand-up meetings / scrums to discuss progress between planning sessions.	As Good Pass, plus: Team member skills reflection is monitored and updated as project progresses. Evidence of revisions to group working agreement as required. Professional team approach to workload and effort	As Excellent, plus:- Regular (and clearly planned) role rotation Evidence of skills-sharing activities (e.g. Pair Programming) and monitoring their impact
Project management / SDLC effectiveness <i>(evidenced via, e.g. Sprint Planning & Review docs, copy Backlogs, if using Agile)</i>	5	No submitted documentation pertaining to: Sprint Planning, Logs, or Review Document lacks any detail surrounding timescales, work undertaken and progress against time. Documentation is reverse engineered (i.e. work logs all completed at the end)	Contemporaneous documentation identifies when work items were completed. Evidence of at least one progress review against intended progress with limited reflection.	As Pass, plus:- Planning documentation clearly identifies work items attempted and completed in a given period Evidence of regular progress reviews against intention, with some reflection. Evidence of complexity estimation per item.	As Clear Pass, plus: Planning documentation clearly identifies who is responsible for a given work item (and any contributors) Some evidence of refined planning accuracy over time. Clear carry-forward of incomplete actions; revising complexity estimation.	As Good Pass, plus:- Progress reviews meaningfully reflect on root cause of issues. Evidence that review suggestions are carried through into future sprints	As Excellent, plus:- Use of appropriate time or complexity planning methods (e.g. Fibonacci estimates, planning poker) Clear refinement of planning as project progresses. Keying system that allows easy linking between work items and other sections of the report (e.g. requirements, designs, etc)
Individual group reflection (INDIVIDUALLY MARKED)	10	No meaningful attempt to describe contributions and assess their teammates. No evidence of engagement in team-forming activities. Significant discrepancies between individual claims and work items indicated in overall project documentation. Marking another team member unacceptable without a clear justification attempt.	Identifies contributions made along with some key details of each contribution. Basic contribution to team forming process; evidence of at least some discussions with potential teammates. Reflection on project to identify themes surrounding teamworking. Minor discrepancies between individual claims and overall project documentation may be present.	Describes contributions made in detail; these align entirely with project documentation. Evidence that your individual skillset was completed and shared with potential teammates. Reflects on teamworking issues, providing specific examples to justify observations Reflects on strengths / weaknesses with limited examples and / or justifications. Writing is relatively clear.	As Clear pass, plus: Greater contribution to team forming process; e.g. evidence of structured discussions with teammates around skillset, agreements. Reflection on own strengths and weaknesses; citing examples and explaining the reasons Writing style is clear and readable.	As Good pass, plus: Further contribution to team forming process still; evidence of team(/member)-seeking activities documented in required formats (e.g. Team seeking “job adverts” on Canvas.) Reflection on own weaknesses includes details of how both the team and the individual overcame the weaknesses. Writing style is persuasive and perceptive.	As Excellent, plus: Active engagement in, (if not active leadership of) team-forming process. Astute observations on team working, identifying even minor failings along with critical reflection on how they may be overcome in future. Writing style is refined.
Analysis (20) --- “Basic, Intermediate and Advanced” refer to the requirements categorised accordingly in the coursework specification							
Functional and non-functional requirements / Brief User Stories	5	Omitted for basic criteria or describing so little as to be meaningless.	Present for most basic criteria. Minimum list of functional requirements for the criteria, along with a brief description of what the requirement involves	As Pass, plus: Describes all basic criteria. Largely correct application of functional vs. non-functional.	As Clear pass, plus: Describes some intermediate criteria. Decomposition into User Stories that provide coverage of required criteria.	As Good Pass, plus: Describes all intermediate criteria User stories are reconciled to avoid trivial and/or epic stories.	As Excellent, plus: Describes advanced criteria Story quality and presentation is refined: Quality is such that they are clear, highly accurate and unambiguous.
Use Cases and Descriptions	10	Omitted for basic criteria or describing so little as to be meaningless. Case descriptions presented bear no relation to specification or diagram.	Present for most basic criteria. Cases mostly align with specified criteria, are described in a recognised format though may have some ambiguities.	As Pass, plus: Describes all basic criteria. Descriptions are clear, and align to both specified criteria and diagram.	As Clear pass, plus: Describes some intermediate criteria. Descriptions are accurate and relevant and capture all key system behaviour. Some minor omissions are acceptable at this level.	As Good Pass, plus: Describes all intermediate criteria Use case descriptions rationalised to avoid trivial (or epics, as above) cases.	As Excellent, plus: Describes advanced criteria Use Cases (and descriptions) show evidence of further rationalisation to minimise duplication and to correctly separate concerns.
Client Consultations / response to feedback	5	No client consultations occurred; or no evidence was submitted in the report.	At least one consultation occurred, and it may have required prompting by the module leader. Evidence of consultation records basic details (time/date/main topics)	As Pass, plus: More than one consultation occurred, of which one may have required prompting by module leader. Submitted evidence records additionally further points of discussion.	As Clear Pass, plus: At least three consultations occurred, organised by the group; aligned with either: -a stand-up / scrum meeting -a sprint review	As Good Pass, plus: Evidence of demonstrations at consultations and collection of client feedback.	As Excellent, plus: Clear indication of how client feedback was fed into project lifecycle

(continued across the page)

Component		Fail 0 – 39%	Pass 40 – 49%	Clear Pass 50-59%	Good Pass 60-69%	Excellent 70-79%	Outstanding 80%+
Design (20)							
Data Design (Class Diagram)	10	Omitted for basic criteria or describing so little as to be meaningless. Clearly reverse-engineered (i.e. derived from the code)	Present for most basic criteria. Evidence of textual analysis across specification. Captures key data types (and key encapsulated data) required to fulfil the problem specification	As Pass, plus: Describes all basic criteria. Key data types encapsulate much relevant data and behaviour. Demonstrated use of design techniques to derive relationships (e.g. CRC cards) and these are indicated on the diagram in some form.	As Clear pass, plus: Describes some intermediate criteria. Consideration is given to how data-carrying types relate to (rest of) system. Correct use of UML relationship or cardinality notation; consistent with implementation relationships. Only very minor errors accepted.	As Good Pass, plus: Describes all intermediate criteria Design evidences excellent practice; significant work towards SOLID – e.g. separating concerns into modular components; application of some MVC principles.	As Excellent, plus: Describes advanced criteria Evidence of outstanding design practice – compliant with SOLID principles.
Basic UI Designs / Storyboarding	5	Omitted for basic criteria or describing so little as to be meaningless. Clearly reverse-engineered (i.e. after the event) designs. No transitional information (between “screens”);	Present for most basic criteria. Conveys key data input/output exchanges, though some detail may be omitted. Conveys some transitional information to capture key steps associated with requirements.	As Pass, plus: Describes all basic criteria. Conveys much transitional information, such that it is possible to follow UI navigation workflow.	As Clear pass, plus: Describes some intermediate criteria. Conveys placement / placement-sensitive information.	As Good Pass, plus: Describes all intermediate criteria Discusses any non-obvious placements and/or complex features (e.g. calculated layouts).	As Excellent, plus: Describes advanced criteria
Behaviour Design (Sequence Diagrams or Activity Diagrams)	5	Omitted for basic criteria or describing so little as to be meaningless. Notation so poor as to be unrecognisable as an example of either diagram type.	Present for most basic criteria. Acceptable notation usage; though some logical constructs may lack significant clarity, the key logic to fulfil a requirement is captured. It is possible to align the logic with the relevant use case(s).	As Pass, plus: Describes all basic criteria. May have faults in notation, though it is still possible to discern purpose of branches (activity) or communication (sequence) if not the precise conditions required. Logic entirely consistent with that in use case.	As Clear pass, plus: Describes some intermediate criteria. Notation may have minor faults, but should convey most conditions (activity) / interactions (sequence) / requisite details.	As Good Pass, plus: Describes all intermediate criteria Notation may have minor errors but must capture relevant details precisely.	As Excellent, plus: Describes advanced criteria Evidence of exceptional engagement – use of advanced notation to capture complex behavioural criteria.
Implementation (20)							
Source Code – functional implementation	15	Software does not fulfil the majority of basic features. Code is either not present, does not compile, or does not meaningfully contribute towards feature set. Comments are unhelpful to the reader.	Software meets most basic criteria set out in the specification Code is largely clearly written, though some elements may be difficult to understand. Comments are present, but may be too verbose or too sparse.	Software meets all basic criteria set out in the specification. Code standard is largely reasonable, though there may be very few areas of confusion. Comments strike a balance between descriptive and concise.	As Clear Pass, plus: Software meets some intermediate requirements Code standard is clear and readable. Some evidence of realising good design practice (e.g. separation of concerns, modularity)	As Good Pass, plus: Software meets all intermediate requirements. Code is aligned to clear standard guidelines. Consistent evidence of realising good design practice (e.g. separation of concerns, modularity).	As Excellent, plus: Software meets Advanced requirements. Commenting adheres to industry standards, with a clear bias towards reuse and maintenance. Evidence of excellent code-level design practice (e.g. SOLID)
Appropriate usage of a source control repository	5	All code is not presented via an accessible SCM, or access details omitted / incorrect. Project or repository naming convention not as specified	All required code is presented in a private SCM, named as specified, accessible to the team and module leader.	SCM shows evidence of multiple group member participation with some commit commenting.	SCM shows timely evidence of multiple group member participation.	As Good Pass, with SCM commit comments giving meaningful description of change set.	As Excellent, with SCM commenting adhering to a clear team standard.
Evaluation, Testing and Profiling (20)							
Evidence of TDD, unit testing, and/or UAT	10	No evidence of any meaningful attempt to test the software.	Basic User Acceptance Testing that can be aligned with the specified requirements	Comprehensive UAT aligned with specified requirements, detailing fixes where required. Unit testing, if present, is limited.	As Clear Pass, along with: Evidence of planned unit testing of 1+ components with consideration of boundary and exceptional conditions (with results)	As Good Pass, plus: Unit testing suite comprising multiple tests across components. Evidence of unit test maintenance as required	As Excellent, also:- Evidence of TDD, including requisite designs and component interfaces.
Evidence of profiling	5	No meaningful attempt at performance measurement or reflection on measurement.	Some basic measure of performance (e.g. stopwatch, currentTimeMillis) with clear indication of method(s) measured.	Basic measure of performance using a profiler (e.g. VisualVM / Netbeans) with relevant interpretation of time used.	Evidence of profiler usage along with some interpretation – progress towards identification of root cause.	As good pass with: -accurate identification of root causes of performance issues -reflection on approaches taken.	As Excellent, with one or more of: -Reflection on alternative approaches and performance implications -Exploration of memory usage
Client Demonstration (INDIVIDUALLY MARKED)	5	No show / no contribution / no meaningful attempt to describe any of the project elements in pass criteria ---OR--- Significant failing in timekeeping	Minor timekeeping lapse permitted Contribution to structured presentation Outline of contributions to project Answers to questions may omit significant details.	As Pass, with: Presentation runs to time Clearly evidenced contributions Straightforward presentation style Answers address significant aspects of posed questions	As Clear Pass, with: Reflection on difficulties faced Clear, prepared presentation style Persuasive and accurate answers to Qs	As Good Pass, plus: Evidenced discussion of personal gains / difficulties overcome Confident, refined presentation style Sophisticated question answering	As Excellent, with: Confident, thoughtful and astute answers to questions posed.