	Weight (%)	N (0-4.9)	P (5 - 5.9)	C (6 - 6.9)	D (7 - 7.9)	HD (8 - 10)
		Unacceptable Fails to identify what is required	**Basic** Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	**Expected** Basic understanding and delivery of what is required.	**Good** Reflects a mastery of what is required	**Excellent** Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required
1.1 Case Study	100%	- Failed to attempt case study 1 Or - Wrong identification of ethical situation (Whether it is ethical issue or legal issue or more) - Forget to analysis ethical situation - Lots extra uncorrelated SE code of ethics - Correlation between SE code of ethics and case study are justified poorly or forget to justify - Case study is not articulated properly - Layout and document styling is very poor	- Majorly, wrong identification of ethical situation (Whether it is ethical issue or legal issue or more) - Most of anlaysis points are missing or identified wrong analysis point when analysising ethical situation - Few of the SE code of ethics are identified correctly with unrelated SE code of ethics - Correlation between SE code of ethics and case study are justified poorly - Case study is not articulated properly - Layout and document styling is poor	- **Mostly correct identification of ethical situation(s) (Whether it is ethical issue or legal issue or more)** - **Some anlaysis points are missing or identified wrong analysis point when analysising ethical situation** - **Some of the SE code of ethics are identified correctly with unrelated SE code of ethics** - **Correlation between SE code of ethics and case study are justified well** - **Articulated the case study in the an acceptable manner with some problems identified with your understanding of the case study** - **Layout and document styling is as expected**	- Correct identification of ethical situation(s) (Whether it is ethical issue or legal issue or more) - Good analysis of ethical situation, a very few anlaysis points are missing or identified wrong analysis point(s) - Majority of the SE code of ethics are identified correctly with some extra unrelated SE code of ethics - Correlation between SE code of ethics and case study are justified properly - Good articulation of the case study some possibility of misinterpretation - Good layout and document styling	- Correct identification of ethical situation(s) (Whether it is ethical issue or legal issue or more) - Appropriate analysis of ethical situation - Majority of the SE code of ethics are identified correctly - Correlation between SE code of ethics and case study are justified excellently - Excellent articulation of the case study with no confusion - Excellent layout and document styling
Late Penalty / Day	10%	**0 Day**	1 Day	2 Day	3 Day	4 Day
Peer Review Adjustment	1	Please refer to your peer review result to understand yourself better, in order to achieve best result, you need to make sure your self rating align with your teammate's rating, and your team average shall align with your own contribution				
Final Total marks	3.4					
Comments:		1. Your analysis of Alex, Barry and Charlie was okay but the clauses 7.07 is not relevant here. They were not really intervening in anyone's career. You are also not mentioning if they had any bad action. They should have assisted David by adhering to clause 7.02. 2. David was offered a task which he is a professional in and so it should not be a bad action for David. It should be other character's discussion. 3. The first 2 points of the head's bad actions should have been actually a good action. He hired someone competent and professional. However, he should have adhered to clause 7.07 so your last mentioned point is okay.				