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**Marksheet & Rubrics**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Group 4** | | **Individual** |
| **Student ID** | **Student Name** | **Idea Improvement (10)** | **Prototype (10)** | **Pitch (10)** | | **TOTAL (30)** | **Comments for Individual:** |
| S10203987G | Lee Yang Jun |  |  |  | |  |  |
| S10224441G | Dominic Lee Lu Yee |  | |  |  |
| S10224441J | Neu You Sheng |  | |  |  |
| S10222337A | Palaniappan Shanthal |  | |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Group Performance (compulsory):**  **Overall (if any):** |

**MARKING RUBRICS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **F** |
| **Group: Idea Improvement**  **(10)** | **10 – 8**   * Able to distill and incorporate all the judges’ and users’ feedback in making the idea very robust and feasible * Used the feedback very constructively and thoughtfully in transforming the idea | **7.5 – 7**   * Able to distill several feedback and incorporate them into making some observable improvements * Used the feedback quite constructively and thoughtfully in transforming the idea | **6.5 – 6**   * Incorporated the judges’ and users’ feedback to make a few improvements but not very transformative * Used some of the feedback but idea was not well thought through | **5.5 – 5**   * Superficial effort in improving the idea * Not able to distill or incorporate the feedback effectively in improving the idea. Idea is ill-conceived. | <=4.5   * Fail to incorporate the feedback and make any changes * Little to no effort in making improvement from judges’ feedback |
| **Group: Prototype (10)** | **10 – 8**   * Prototype constructed contains all essential details and functions * All key ideas/concepts are very well explained through the use of prototype * Comprehensive testing of prototype | **7.5 – 7**   * Prototype constructed contains most essential details and functions * Most key ideas/concepts are explained through the use of prototype * Adequate testing of prototype | **6.5 – 6**   * Prototype constructed with some missing details and functions * Some key ideas/concepts are explained through the use of prototype * Some testing of prototype, but certainly can do more | **5.5 – 5**   * Prototype constructed is lacking details and functions * Barely any ideas/concepts are explained through the use of prototype * Inadequate testing of prototype | **<=4.5**   * Prototype constructed is lacking major details and functions * Disconnect between their ideas and the prototype * Critical functions/ features of prototype not tested * **No prototype = 0** |
| **Individual: Pitch (10)** | **10 – 8**   * Very confident, persuasive & smooth delivery, with good non-verbal cues. * Very familiar with the content * Very good Q&A | **7.5 – 7**   * Quite confident, persuasive and rather smooth delivery * Quite familiar with the content * Good Q&A | **6.5 – 6**   * Not quite persuasive and fluent * Familiar with the content but with missing gaps * Q&A needs some prompting | * **5.5 – 5** * Not fluent and smooth * Not familiar with the content * Poor Q&A with incomplete, weak answers | **<=4.5**   * Not fluent, incoherent or/and inaudible * Does not know his/her work at all * Unable to answer questions * **Absent without valid reasons = 0** |