Group project total mark: 25% (**Project report: 22.5%** and Milestones: 5x 0.5%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Fail**  **(<50%)** | **Pass**  **(50% - 64%)** | **Credit**  **(65% - 74%)** | **Distinction**  **(75% - 84%)** | **High Distinction**  **(85% - 100%)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Structure** (0.5 pts)**:** How is the structure of the report? | * Structure & physical layout detract from work * Many inaccuracies * Considerable lack of detail in presentation | * Poor attempt at structure and physical layout * Many inaccuracies in presentation of work | * Fair attempt at structure and physical layout * Some inaccuracies in presentation | * Very good logical structure, physical layout and attention to detail * Work presented in coherent and accurate manner | * Excellent logical structure, physical layout and appropriate attention to detail * The work is presented in an accurate, concise and coherent fashion |
| **Grammar/spelling** (0.5 pts): Are there any grammar and/or spelling errors? | * Numerous spelling mistakes and/or grammar errors detract from work * Writing is poor | * Multiple spelling mistakes and/or grammatical errors * Errors make reading difficult | * Occasional spelling mistakes and/or grammatical errors * Errors distract from reading | * Minimal spelling mistakes and/or grammatical errors | * No spelling mistakes and/or grammatical errors |
| **Executive Summary** (0.5 pts)**:** Are the summaries of project justification, aim and scope included? | * Summary is unclear. * Poorly written * Contains many errors * Missing details * Incomplete * Plagiarised | * Poorly written * Lacking details * Wordy | * Satisfactorily written * A few missing details | * Concise and well written * Addresses all or most sections within the proposal. | * Concise, detailed and very well written * Addresses all sections. |
| **Background** (1 pts)  - Has the issue / problem / opportunity / market gap been described clearly?  - Has a description been provided on existing or similar relevant projects? | * Unclear description of project * Missing or incomplete description of similar relevant projects * Missing or incomplete reason of choosing the project * Poorly written * Contains many errors * Missing or incomplete details * Plagiarised | * Acceptable description of project * Incomplete description of similar relevant projects * Incomplete reason of choosing the project * Poorly written * Lacking details * Wordy | * Satisfactory description of project * Satisfactory description of similar relevant projects * Satisfactory reason of choosing the project * Satisfactorily written * A few missing details | * Concise and well written description of project * Concise and well written description of similar relevant projects * Concise and well written reason of choosing the project | * Concise, detailed and very well written description of project * Concise, detailed and very well written description of similar relevant projects * Concise, detailed and very well written reason of choosing the project |
| **Evaluation of Alternatives** (1.5 pts)  - How are the alternative projects evaluated?  - How is the Project Selection Matrix presented? | * Unclear description of alternative projects * Missing or incomplete explanation and justification of project selection * Missing or incomplete Project Selection Matrix * Poorly written * Contains many errors * Missing or incomplete details * Missing summary and analysis of the outcome * Plagiarised | * Acceptable description of alternative projects * Incomplete explanation and justification of project selection * Incomplete Project Selection Matrix * Poorly written * Lacking details * Acceptable summary and analysis of the outcome * Wordy | * Satisfactory description of alternative projects * Satisfactory explanation and justification of project selection * Satisfactory Project Selection Matrix * Satisfactorily written * A few missing details * Satisfactory summary and analysis of the outcome | * Concise and well written description of alternative projects * Concise and well written explanation and justification of project selection * Concise and well-constructed Project Selection Matrix * Concise and well written summary and analysis of the outcome | * Concise, detailed and very well written description of alternative projects * Concise, detailed and very well written explanation and justification of project selection * Concise, detailed and very well-constructed Project Selection Matrix * Concise, detailed and very well written summary and analysis of the outcome |
| **Project Concept** (1.5 pts)**:**  - How is the concept of the project described?  - Are project objectives, requirements and deliverables included? | * Unclear or difficult to understand Project Concept * Missing or incomplete overview of project concept and discussion of various aspects and components * Missing or incomplete project objectives * Missing or incomplete project requirements and deliverables * Missing details * Unclear, shows lack of understanding * Plagiarised | * Acceptable Project Concept * Acceptable overview of project concept and discussion of various aspects and components * Acceptable project objectives * Acceptable project requirements and deliverables * Lacking details | * Satisfactory description of Project Concept * Satisfactory overview of project concept and discussion of various aspects and components * Clear project objectives * Most project requirements and deliverables are accurately identified * A few missing details | * Clear and accurate description of Project Concept * Clear and accurate overview of project concept and discussion of various aspects and components are clear * Clear and accurate project objectives * All project requirements and deliverables are accurately identified | * Project concept is clear, accurate and presented in an excellent manner * Overview of project concept and discussion of various aspects and components are clear, accurate and presented in an excellent manner * Clear and accurate project objectives * All project requirements and deliverables are accurately identified and presented in an excellent manner |
| **Project Feasibility** (2.5 pts)**:**  - How is the feasibility of the project discussed? | * Unclear discussion of project feasibility * Missing identification of strength and weakness * Missing Approval requirements * Missing or incomplete project assumptions * Missing or incomplete project constraints * Missing or incomplete expected benefits and dis-benefits * Missing Investment appraisal * Missing details * Shows lack of understanding * Plagiarised | * Acceptable discussion of project feasibility * Acceptable identification of strength and weakness * Acceptable Approval requirements * Acceptable project assumptions * Acceptable project constraints * Acceptable expected benefits and dis-benefits * Acceptable Investment appraisal * Lacking details | * Satisfactory discussion of project feasibility * Satisfactory identification of strength and weakness * Satisfactory Approval requirements * Satisfactory project assumptions * Satisfactory project constraints * Satisfactory expected benefits and dis-benefits * Satisfactory Investment appraisal | * Concise and well written discussion of project feasibility * Concise and well written identification of strength and weakness * Concise and well written Approval requirements * Concise and well written project assumptions * Concise and well written project constraints * Concise and well written expected benefits and dis-benefits * Concise and well written Investment appraisal | * Concise, detailed and very well written discussion of project feasibility * Concise, detailed and very well written identification of strength and weakness * Concise, detailed and very well written Approval requirements * Concise, detailed and very well written project assumptions * Concise, detailed and very well written project constraints * Concise, detailed and well written expected benefits and dis-benefits * Concise, detailed and well written Investment appraisal |
| **Project Product Breakdown Structure (PBS), Organisation & Communication Management (4 pts):**  - How are the PBS, Organisation and Communication Management presented? | * Missing, incomplete or unclear organogram * Missing description of roles and responsibilities * Missing PBS * Missing or incomplete project Plan * Missing communication management approach * Missing details * Shows lack of understanding * Plagiarised | * Acceptable organogram * Acceptable description of roles and responsibilities * Acceptable PBS * Acceptable project Plan * Acceptable communication management approach * Lacking details | * Satisfactory organogram * Satisfactory description of roles and responsibilities * Satisfactory PBS * Satisfactory project Plan * Satisfactory communication management approach * A few details missing | * Concise and well-presented organogram * Concise and well-written description of roles and responsibilities * Concise and well-outlined PBS * Concise and well-written Project plan * Concise and well-developed communication management approach * Most details are included | * Concise and very well-presented organogram * Concise and very well-written description of roles and responsibilities * Concise and very well-outlined PBS * Concise and very well-written project Plan * Concise and very well-developed communication management approach |
| **Project Quality Management (PQM)** (3 pts)**:**  Are the following provided in PQM?  - Product descriptions  - Quality control activities  - A report format for recording quality control activities  - One of the 7 basic tools of quality | * Poorly written * Contains many errors * Missing details * Incomplete * Unclear, shows lack of understanding * Plagiarised | * Poorly written * Lacking details * Wordy | * Satisfactorily written * A few missing details | * Concise and well written * Addresses all or most sections. | * Concise, detailed and very well written * Addresses all sections. |
| **Project Risk Management (PRM)** (2.5 pts)**:**  Are the following provided in PRM?  - Risk Management Approach  - Risk matrix (Probability/Impact Matrix)  - Risk management procedure  - Risk responses to threats and opportunities | * Poorly written * Contains many errors * Missing details * Incomplete * Unclear, shows lack of understanding * Plagiarised | * Poorly written * Lacking details * Wordy | * Satisfactorily written * A few missing details | * Concise and well written * Addresses all or most sections. | * Concise, detailed and very well written * Addresses all sections. |
| **Change and Issue Management** (2 pts)**:**  Are the following provided in this section?  - List of issues related to project  - Outline of change management process and change authority  - Outline how you track and control the configuration items for your project. | * Poorly written * Contains many errors * Missing details * Incomplete * Unclear, shows lack of understanding * Plagiarised | * Poorly written * Lacking details * Wordy | * Satisfactorily written * A few missing details | * Concise and well written * Addresses all or most sections. | * Concise, detailed and very well written * Addresses all sections. |
| **Project Progress Control (PPC)** (2 pts)**:**  Are the following provided in PPC?  - Different adopted project control mechanisms  - Outline of allowable tolerances (time, cost, quality, benefit, scope, and risk at the different levels of management)  - Project plan split into stage plans | * Poorly written * Contains many errors * Missing details * Incomplete * Unclear, shows lack of understanding * Plagiarised | * Poorly written * Lacking details * Wordy | * Satisfactorily written * A few missing details | * Concise and well written * Addresses all or most sections. | * Concise, detailed and very well written * Addresses all sections. |
| **Conclusion and References** (1pt)**:**  - Have all statements been referenced?  - Has referencing been done properly?  - How is the structure of conclusion? | * Failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others * Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. * No references * Unattributed statements * Plagiarised statements * Incomplete conclusion | * Poor use of referencing * Multiple errors in referencing and/or bibliography formatting * Poor attempt to acknowledge the work of others. * Most statements are unsubstantiated. * Poor conclusion | * Fair use of references * Errors in referencing and/or reference list * Mostly acknowledges the work of others * Many statements are unsubstantiated. * Satisfactory conclusion | * Good use of references * Appropriate referencing style with a correctly formatted reference list * Appropriately acknowledges the work of others * Many statements are substantiated with references * Concise and well written conclusion | * Excellent use of references * Appropriate referencing style with a correctly formatted reference list * Appropriately acknowledges the work of others * All statements are substantiated with valid references * Excellent conclusion |