Future Skills

Micro-Credentials in Software Development

Certificate in Introductory Software Development MCSD 51

Marking Rubric (Part 1 ONLY)

Marking Rubric							
Criteria	**0% - 39% (E)**	**40% - 49% (D)**	**50% – 69% (C)**	**70% – 84% (B)**	**85% – 100% (A)**	**Maximum Marks**	**Student Marks**
System Proposal (LOs 1, 2 & 4) **30 Marks**	Very poor structure and quality of writing No or incomplete description on the project background, stakeholders, objectives, and expected outcomes	The proposal is of poor quality with many problems in writing and structure of report Very little / insufficient description on the project background, stakeholders, objectives, and expected outcomes	The proposal is of acceptable quality with some problems in writing and structure of report Little description on the project background, stakeholders, objectives, and expected outcomes	The proposal is written with good quality but has minor issues Good description on the project background, stakeholders, objectives, and expected outcomes	The proposal is well-written and organised with professional quality Excellent description on the project background, stakeholders, objectives, and expected outcomes.	10	7

Commented [SH1]: The proposal for the "DaySave App" is well-organized with clear background, objectives, and user stories. However, using plain text and external links reduces its professional quality. Embedded visuals and formatting are recommended.

	Missing or mostly incorrect use cases	Very few or poorly identified use cases	A few use cases are fairly identified	A reasonable number of use cases are correctly identified	Use cases are comprehensively identified	5	5
	Incompetent analysis of ethical and cultural impacts	Inadequate analysis of ethical and cultural impacts	Fair analysis of ethical and cultural impacts	Acceptable analysis of ethical and cultural impacts	Comprehensive analysis of ethical and cultural impacts	5	5
	Missing project timeline or very poor-quality timeline	Poor-quality timeline with insufficient and unclear detail	Adequate timeline with sufficient detail	Good timeline with sufficient detail	High-quality and very detailed timeline	5	5
	Missing or very poor problem domain sketch and incorrect use case diagrams	Poor problem domain sketch and use case diagrams	Adequate problem domain sketch and use case diagrams	Reasonable problem domain sketch and use case diagrams	Excellent problem domain sketch and use case diagrams	5	4
Total						**30**	26

FEEDBACK

The proposal for the "DaySave App" is well-structured, with clear objectives, user stories, and thoughtful ethical analysis. However, all visuals should be embedded in the document, and proper formatting applied to enhance professionalism—external links should serve only as supplementary reference for the evaluator.

Commented [SH2]: The student has clearly defined user stories and use cases, effectively identifying key functionalities and user interactions. The use case identification is comprehensive, with no major issues noted.

Commented [SH3]: The student has thoroughly addressed ethical and cultural impacts, emphasizing equity, data protection, fair use, and cultural inclusivity—ensuring the DaySave App reflects responsible, secure, and respectful technology aligned with New Zealand values.

Commented [SH4]: The student has effectively presented a detailed weekly timeline with clearly broken-down tasks, demonstrating strong planning. However, the Gantt chart should be embedded in the document rather than linked externally via GitHub

Commented [SH5]: The student presented a clear and detailed domain sketch and use case diagrams with well-defined notations. However, embedding diagrams in the report itself would improve accessibility and overall presentation quality.