# 4th Year Projects Marking Rubric (100% - Equates to 75% of the overall Project)

| Criteria \Grade | H1 (80 - 100) | H1 (70-79) | H2.1 (60-69) | H2.2 (50-59) | Pass (40-49) | Compensation (35-39) | Fail (0-34) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Artefact Development (65%)** — Difficulty (15%) | A project that addresses all complex issues in the area of a specialisation, beyond the programme expectation. | A project that outstandingly addresses complex issues in the area of specialisation. | A project that demonstrates to a very good degree the addressing of complex issues in the area of specialisation. | A project that demonstrates to a good degree the addressing of complex issues in the area of specialisation. | A project that demonstrates to an adequate degree the addressing of complex issues in the area of specialisation. | A project that somewhat addresses complex issues in the area of specialisation but with some misconceptions. | A project that insufficiently addresses complex issues in the area of specialisation but with some misconceptions. |
| Innovation (10%) | Evidence of exploiting or using a new idea or leading edge feature of new or emerging technology beyond the programme expectations | Evidence of exploiting or using a new idea or leading edge feature of new or emerging technology to an outstanding degree | Evidence of exploiting or using a new idea or leading edge feature of new or emerging technology to a very good degree | Evidence of exploiting or using a new idea or leading edge feature of new or emerging technology to a good degree | Evidence of exploiting or using a new idea or leading edge feature of new or emerging technology to an adequate degree | Evidence of some exploitation or using a new idea or leading edge feature of new or emerging technology but with some misconceptions. | Evidence of inadequate exploitation or in adequate use of a new idea or leading edge feature of new or emerging technology. |
| Completeness (10%) | Project has commercial potential and addresses all requirements that have been documented beyond the programme expectation. | Project is showing commercial potential and addresses all requirements that have been outstandingly documented. | Project is showing commercial potential and addresses all requirements that have been documented. | Project demonstrates effort but is not at the standard of commercialisation potential. | Project demonstrates adequate effort but is not at the standard of commercialisation potential. | Project demonstrates some effort with misconceptions and is not at the standard of commercialisation potential. | Project demonstrates inadequate effort and is not at the standard of commercialisation potential. |
| Implementation (30%) | Implementation of the system as demonstrated by the students own coding / artefact development which is beyond the programme expectation. Use of coding / data analysis principles beyond programme expectations. | Outstanding implementation / artefact development of the system as demonstrated by the students own coding / data analysis. Outstanding use of coding / data analysis principles. | Very good degree of implementation of the system as demonstrated by the students own coding / artefact development. Very good use of coding principles / data analysis principles. | Good degree of implementation of the system as demonstrated by the students own coding / artefact development. Good use of coding principles / data analysis principles. | Adequate implementation of the system as demonstrated by the students own coding / artefact development. Adequate use of coding principles / data analysis principles. | Some implementation of the system as demonstrated by the students own coding / artefact development but with some misconceptions. Some use of coding principles / data analysis principles. | Inadequate implementation with obvious functionality lacking. Inadequate use of coding principles / data analysis principles. |
| Testing (10%) | Demonstrates validation and testing as evidenced by system testing, integration, class & unit testing. | Demonstrating outstanding testing as evidenced by system testing, integration, class & unit testing. | Demonstrating very good testing as evidenced by system testing, testing of several classes or several programs that combine into a system. | Demonstrating good testing as evidenced by class or program testing. | Demonstrating adequate testing of operations in a class or a functions in a procedural program. | Demonstrating some testing of operations in a class or a functions in a procedural program but with some misconceptions. | Demonstrating inadequate testing of operations in a class or a functions in a procedural program but with some misconceptions. |
| **Communication Skills (25%)** — Technical Report (inc. Configuration Manual) - 10% | The technical report and user manual is organised and written to the standard of a research thesis. All relevant information has been integrated beyond the expectation of the programme. | The technical report and user manual is outstandingly organised and written. All relevant information has been outstandingly integrated. | The technical report and user manual are very well organised and written. All relevant information has been substantially integrated. | The technical report and user manual are well organised and written. All relevant information has been integrated. | The technical report and user manual are adequately organised and written. All relevant information has been adequately integrated. | The technical report and user manual are somewhat organised and written. All relevant information has been adequately integrated. | The technical report is unsatisfactory and incomplete. |
| Supervisor Interaction (5%) | The project demonstrates to a standard beyond what is expected, that there is interaction with the supervisor as evident by monthly reflective journals, emails, midterm | The project demonstrates to an excellent standard that there is interaction with the supervisor as evident by monthly reflective journals, emails, midterm presentation and meetings. | The project demonstrates to a very high standard that there is interaction with the supervisor as evident by monthly reflective journals, emails, midterm presentation and meetings. | The project demonstrates to a high standard that there is interaction with the supervisor as evident by monthly reflective journals, emails, midterm presentation and meetings. | The project adequately demonstrates that there is interaction with the supervisor as evident by monthly reflective journals, emails, midterm presentation and meetings. | The project somewhat demonstrates that there is interaction with the supervisor as evident by monthly reflective journals, emails, midterm presentation and meetings. | The project inadequatly demonstrates that there is interaction with the supervisor as evident by monthly reflective journals, emails, midterm presentation and meetings. |
| Presentation (5%) | The project argument was proferred in a manner that was beyond the normal programme expectations for the presentation. Slides were error-free and logically presented. The speaker was poised and enthusiastic. Questions were answered beyond the expectation of the programme. | The project argument was outstandingly clear in the presentation. Slides were error free and logically presented. The speaker was poised and enthusiastic. Questions were outstandingly answered. | The project argument was very clear in the presentation. Slides were error-free and logically presented. The speaker was poised and enthusiastic. Questions were very well answered. | The project argument was clear in the presentation. Slides were error free and logically presented. The speaker was poised and enthusiastic. Questions were well answered. | The presentation adequately outlined the project argument. Slides were adequately presented. The speaker was poised and enthusiastic. Questions were adequately answered. | The presentation somewhat outlined the project argument. Slides were somewhat presented with some misconceptions. The speaker was somewhat enthusiastic. Some questions were answered. | The presentation inadequately outlined the project argument. Slides were inadequately presented. The speaker was inadequately presented and lacked enthusiasm. Questions were inadequately answered. |
| Showcase (5%) | **Approved Project Profile (3%)** | | | | **Project Poster (2%)** | | |