## Assessment Criteria/Mark Scheme:

**Critically evaluate the project with reference to supporting evidence from the project and wider literature:**

1. The system produced and how functional and non-functional requirements were addressed (25 Marks)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Description of quality** |
| 22-25 | Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive review of system. Strong supporting evidence. Non-functional requirements including cyber security considered well. Exceptional overall. Difficult to fault. |
| 20-21 | Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive review of system. Strong supporting evidence. Non-functional requirements including cyber security considered well. Any criticisms / areas for improvement are very minor. Outstanding overall. |
| 17-19 | Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive review of system. Strong supporting evidence. Non-functional requirements including cyber security considered well. Any criticisms / areas for improvement are minor. Excellent overall. |
| 15-16 | Well written, all elements considered and largely critical in tone but lacking insight. Substantial review of system. Claims evidenced well. Strong consideration of non-functional requirements including cyber security. A good to very good evaluation. |
| 12-14 | Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is not well written or presented. Review of system lacks both consideration and evidence. Some consideration of non-functional requirements including cyber security. A satisfactory evaluation. |
| 10-11 | Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak review of system missing some elements with poor evidence. Little consideration of non-functional requirements (however they are considered). A weak but satisfactory evaluation. |
| 7-9 | Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed, weak or absent evidence. Lacking in evaluation. Overall unsatisfactory. |
| 1-6 | A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor. |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |

1. Project Management, Process and Personal Achievement (25 Marks)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Description of quality** |
| 22-25 | Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on tools and techniques used. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault. |
| 20-21 | Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on tools and techniques used. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor. |
| 17-19 | Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on tools and techniques used. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Excellent overall. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor. |
| 15-16 | Well written, all elements considered and largely critical in tone but lacking insight. Substantial review of techniques/tools used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. Overall good to very good. |
| 12-14 | Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of tools techniques used is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. Overall satisfactory. |
| 10-11 | Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding tools and techniques. Overall poor but satisfactory. |
| 7-9 | Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. Not satisfactory |
| 1-6 | A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor. |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |

3. Professional Issues related to your project, its future use and how these would be mitigated (10 Marks)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Description of quality** |
| 9-10 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault. |
| 8 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor. |
| 7 | Excellent discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall excellent. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor. |
| 6 | Well written and largely critical discussion of the issues involved but lacking insight. Substantial review issues used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. The vast majority of issues identified are mitigated. Overall good to very good. There are areas of improvement that prevent the answer from being excellent. |
| 5 | Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of issue involved is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. There is some attempt to mitigate the majority of pertinent issues. Overall satisfactory. |
| 4 | Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding the issues. There is some attempt to mitigate some of the pertinent issues. Overall poor but satisfactory (just). |
| 3 | Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. May lack mitigation. Not satisfactory. |
| 1-2 | A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor. |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |

4. Legal Issues related to your project, its future use and how these would be mitigated (10 Marks)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Description of quality** |
| 9-10 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault. |
| 8 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor. |
| 7 | Excellent discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall excellent. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor. |
| 6 | Well written and largely critical discussion of the issues involved but lacking insight. Substantial review issues used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. The vast majority of issues identified are mitigated. Overall good to very good. There are areas of improvement that prevent the answer from being excellent. |
| 5 | Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of issue involved is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. There is some attempt to mitigate the majority of pertinent issues. Overall satisfactory. |
| 4 | Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding the issues. There is some attempt to mitigate some of the pertinent issues. Overall poor but satisfactory (just). |
| 3 | Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. May lack mitigation. Not satisfactory. |
| 1-2 | A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor. |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |

5. Social Issues related to your project, its future use and how these would be mitigated (10 Marks)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Description of quality** |
| 9-10 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault. |
| 8 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor. |
| 7 | Excellent discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall excellent. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor. |
| 6 | Well written and largely critical discussion of the issues involved but lacking insight. Substantial review issues used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. The vast majority of issues identified are mitigated. Overall good to very good. There are areas of improvement that prevent the answer from being excellent. |
| 5 | Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of issue involved is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. There is some attempt to mitigate the majority of pertinent issues. Overall satisfactory. |
| 4 | Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding the issues. There is some attempt to mitigate some of the pertinent issues. Overall poor but satisfactory (just) |
| 3 | Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. May lack mitigation. Not satisfactory |
| 1-2 | A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor. |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |

1. Ethical Issues related to your project, its future use and how these would be mitigated (10 Marks)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Description of quality** |
| 9-10 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault. |
| 8 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor. |
| 7 | Excellent discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall excellent. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor. |
| 6 | Well written and largely critical discussion of the issues involved but lacking insight. Substantial review issues used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. The vast majority of issues identified are mitigated. Overall good to very good. There are areas of improvement that prevent the answer from being excellent. |
| 5 | Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of issue involved is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. There is some attempt to mitigate the majority of pertinent issues. Overall satisfactory. |
| 4 | Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding the issues. There is some attempt to mitigate some of the pertinent issues. Overall poor but satisfactory (just). |
| 3 | Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. May lack mitigation. Not satisfactory. |
| 1-2 | A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor. |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |

1. Cybersecurity issues related to your project, its future use and how these would be mitigated (10 marks)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Description of quality** |
| 9-10 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault. |
| 8 | Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor. |
| 7 | Excellent discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. All issues identified are mitigated. Overall excellent. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor. |
| 6 | Well written and largely critical discussion of the issues involved but lacking insight. Substantial review issues used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. The vast majority of issues identified are mitigated. Overall good to very good. There are areas of improvement that prevent the answer from being excellent. |
| 5 | Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of issue involved is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. There is some attempt to mitigate the majority of pertinent issues. Overall satisfactory. |
| 4 | Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding the issues. There is some attempt to mitigate some of the pertinent issues. Overall poor but satisfactory (just). |
| 3 | Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. May lack mitigation. Not satisfactory. |
| 1-2 | A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor. |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |