|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student No:** |  | **Name:** |  |

The following is indicative of the quality of the work submitted

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Visualisation (70%) | X | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Notes** |
| Work is appropriate for Level 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical / design skills evident |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Creativity in chosen subject matter |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plenty of interactivity for the users |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| User can learn something from the visualisation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solution to explain complex/difficult elements |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implementation of sensory outputs (sound/touch) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depth of knowledge demonstrated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project suitable for demonstrating to potential employers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accessing product/project is straightforward |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Documentation (30%) | | X | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |  | **Notes** | | |  |
| Well designed and formatted | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | |
| Use of images, info graphics and icons | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Written in an appropriate academic style | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Knowledge of background theory | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideas communicated effectively | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of iterative designs/planning (storyboards) | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Usage of references to support statements | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  | |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments** |
|  |

*\*where x indicates item not complete, 1 is poor and 5 is excellent*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark**  **%** | **Comment** | **Grade &**  **Characteristics** | **Theory &**  **Academic Approach** | **Practice &**  **Deliverables** |
| 0 |  | **Fail** | plagiarism, collusion, non-pres., name only | as theory |
| 1-39 |  | **Reassess:**  ***inadequate but recoverable with effort*** | no understanding, very short, inadequate, factual but little interpretation, lacks coherence, short, errors, misconceptions, coherent but mechanical notes, partial - rudimentary answer, limited interpretation, lack of knowledge of topic, no evidence of background reading, weak English but some appropriate use of language of topic. | poor effective deliverables, requirements not met, deliverables partially complete, limited response to brief. |
| 40-49 |  | **3rd, D**  **Pass: Sufficient for award of credit**  ***adequate mainly descriptive approach, fair, limited conceptual or theoretical ability*** | adequate response, demonstration of basic knowledge, relevant content, clear intention communicated, evidence of reading, acceptable minimum level of English for business presentation but may lack precision, some limited analysis / application of knowledge / theory / weighting of evidence, inconsistent | deliverables meet basic requirement correctly but limited, just adequate but not innovative, interesting or exciting, for higher marks, 45+ just exceeds minimum specification, might be good in some areas but not consistent |
| 50-59 |  | **2ii, C**  **Satisfactory**  ***Satisfactory with some conceptual ability but lacks good evaluation or synthesis of ideas*** | good response to task, collates info, *satisfactory* analysis & judgement, constructs generalisations based on evidence & opinion, argues clearly, logically & constructs a case, some limited ability to state a personal position, correct English with few imprecise statements | good deliverables, some evidence of good design or execution, coherent and organised product, some limited evidence of self criticism concerning deliverable, some independence, initiative, autonomy, appropriate techniques, integration of knowledge for task |
| 60-69 |  | **2i, B**  **Good.**  ***Good analysis, evaluation, synthesis, integration & argument.*** | evaluates info. & synthesises generalisations, good ability to state & defend personal position, good analysis & judgement, applies knowledge to new situations, sound on theory, critical, understands limitations of methods, selective coherent & logical approach, well written with clear, correct and precise English | all criteria met to **good** standard, evidence of good design or execution, good integration of academic & practical issues, solid evidence of self critique/evaluation of deliverables, products well organised - documented - coherent. Evidence of independence, initiative, autonomy, creativity, adaptability, resourcefulness. Integration of knowledge, |
| 70-79 |  | **First class, A,**  **Excellent.**  ***as above but also stronger evidence of excellent, original, innovative, articulate work*** | very strong ability to state & defend position, uses criteria & weighting in judgements, wide knowledge and theoretical ability, full understanding of possibilities and limitations of methods & theories, *75+* more original, innovative approach, command of critical positions, lively articulate writing, excellent grasp of material - synthesis of ideas | most criteria met to **high** standard, strong evidence of evaluation of deliverables, *75+:* deliverables excellent - all criteria met in clear and definite manner, evidence of excellent design or execution, elegance, innovation, very good evaluation of deliverables, |
| 80-89 |  | **Outstanding.**  ***as above but also***  ***authoritative, superlative,***  ***creative*** | **as above but also :-**  seen all possibilities in task, gone beyond accepted conceptual/critical positions, evidence of creative, intelligent, innovative approach consistently & forcefully expressed | **as above but also :-**  all aspects of deliverables superlative  beyond 80% emphasis on theory rather than practice/deliverables |
| 90-100 |  | **Faultless** | **as for 80-89 but also :-**  all work superlative & without fault | as for 80-89 |