**Higher Diploma Guided Technology**

**INDIVIDUAL Project**

**Student Name: «F1» «F2»**

**Student ID : «F3»**

**MARKING RUBRIC –ELEMENTS**

**Initial Plan (1%) - End of Week 3**

**1% awarded for submission of plan ON TIME**

**MARK AWARDED: «F20»**

**QUALITY OF DRAFT CHAPTER 1 (2%) - End of Week 5**

**2% awarded for submission of plan ON TIME**

**MARK AWARDED: «F24»**

**INTERIM PEER REVIEW PRESENTATION (5%) - During Week 6/7**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **0** | **1-2** | **3-5** |
| Did not attend/record presentation | Presented but did not appear to have a good understanding of their project.  and/or  Presentation slides were not well designed | Presented in a professional manner AND  Good(3) to Excellent(5) use of slides as aids to showcase work completed to date |

**MARK AWARDED: «F18»**

**ATTENDANCE & ENGAGEMENT (at Supervision Sessions) - (10%)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **0-1** | **2-6** | **7-10** |
| Did not attend at any supervised sessions  OR  Attended a small number of sessions but was not able to show any progress through the project. | Attended only a small number of sessions  OR  Attended most sessions, but was not able to show any progress through the project; demonstrated only a very limited level of engagement in the project tasks. | Attended all (or nearly all) sessions.  AND  Was able to show progress through the project and demonstrated a willingness to engage with project tasks. |

**MARK AWARDED: «F17»**

**Self-Evaluation Submissions (10%) – SUBMITTED WEEKLY, commencing in Week 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **0-3** | **4-6** | **7-10** |
| Submissions shows no evidence of having engaged with project learning process  Has not included BOTH positive and negative experiences | Submissions show some evidence of BOTH positive and negative experiences, but these are not always clear.  Submissions show some level of engagement with project learning, but this needs to improve. | Submissions show evidence of positive and negative experiences.  Submissions indicate that student has engaged with learning process in respect of project. |

**MARK AWARDED: «F22»**

**Reflective Journal (5%) – Presentation Week**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **0** | **1-2** | **3-4** | **5** |
| Reflection is not done, or has not shown any actual reflection on the project, but might be just a list of tasks that were completed | Reflection has been done, but is extremely limited / only a partial effort.  Very minimal evidence of reflection on the project | Good reflection that meets minimum requirements and may exceed these in some respects.  Shows that the student has thought about their project process and how they might improve if they were to do another project in the future | Excellent reflection that shows student has put a lot of thought into the project process.  Exceeds minimum requirements in most respects. |

**MARK AWARDED: «F23»**

**Final Report Document & Plan (32 total%) – End of Week 10**

**[Remember that there was 1 Mk for draft plan and 2 mks for a draft chp1]**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **0** | **1--11** | **12-18** | **19-22** | **22-25** | **26-32** |
| Not submitted or largely incomplete | Indicators:  Very limited document that does not meet minimum standard  Poor structure / document will need to be significantly re-written  Little or no evidence of having done any research.  Plan is missing, or the draft plan has been included without any change or context | Indicators:  Reasonable document that meets minimum requirements.  Draft plan has been included, but not explained or updated properly. Only minor changes have been made.  Implementation section provides only basic details of technologies used and how the design was implemented.  Some evidence that testing has been done, but this should have been much more extensive  Some evidence of research – should have been much more extensive | Indicators:  Good document that goes beyond minimum requirements.  Draft plan has been updated considerably and explained well  Implementation section provides clear detail of technologies used and clearly describes how the design was implemented.  Clear evidence that testing has been done, though there may be some gaps.  Good evidence of research – some scope for more work | Indicators:  A generally excellent document that is of a very high standard  Implementation section provides clear detail of technologies used and clearly describes how the design was implemented.  Draft plan has been updated extremely well and has been explained very well.  Clear evidence that testing has been done, with no or very few gaps evident.  Strong evidence of research that has been presented properly. | A superb document that is of an extremely high standard thoughout.  Draft plan has been updated comprehensively and has been explained extremely well.  Extensive evidence that testing has been done, with no evident.  Extensive evidence of research that has been presented properly. |

**Total: «F21» + «F25»**

**FINAL PRESENTATION (5%) - During Presentation Week**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **0** | **1-2** | **3-5** |
| Did not attend/record presentation | Presented but did not appear to have a good understanding of their project.  Presentation slides were not well designed  Limited ability to answer questions about the project | Presented in a professional manner.  Excellent use of slides as aids to showcase work completed to date  Was able to answer questions about the project in a coherent way |

**MARK AWARDED: «F19»**

**Final Prototype (30%) – End of Week 10**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Heading** | **1-11 marks overall**  (Very Weak: 1-5 marks)  (Weak: 6-8 marks)  (Marginal Fail: 9-11 marks) | **12-18 marks overall**  (Pass – 12-14 marks)  (Merit: 15-17 marks) | **19-30 marks overall**  (Very Good/High Merit: 18-20 marks  ; Distinction: 21-30) |
| **Design** | * difficult to use / understand * System inputs cause unexpected results | * System works – use cases achievable * System response / interactions are predictable / intuitive | * sleek look and feel * easy to use / navigate * feels like a professional application/system |
| **Completeness of Prototype Build** | * Not an integrated system – disjoint, un-integrated components * One or more components not working | * system composed of features / integrated components * One or two system features may not be working fully BUT project implementation still forms a coherent system that does a job | * all features of system work well * no apparent missing features – the presented system appears coherent and whole |
| **Technical Competence** | * Below skill level required for the project * Little or no evidence of technical competence | * technical competence at a level appropriate for project * some evidence of technical challenge   one or more interesting features implemented | * successful implementation of technically challenging feature |

**MARK AWARDED: «F26»**

**SUMMARY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Draft Plan** | **«F20»** |
| **Draft Chp 1** | **«F24»** |
| **Interim Presentation (Recorded)** | **«F18»** |
| **Attendance/Engagement** | **«F17»** |
| **Self-Evaluations** | **«F22»** |
| **Final Reflection** | **«F23»** |
| **Final Report & Planning** | **«F21»+«F25»** |
| **Final Presentation (Recorded) & QA Session** | **«F19»** |
| **Final Artefact** | **«F26»** |
| **TOTAL** | **«F27»** |