

Marking Criterion

1. Understanding of Stakeholder Impact (0.5 marks max)

- Excellent (0.5): Clearly explains how stakeholders can improve the industry with coding knowledge. Provides at least 3 relevant and well-explained examples.
- Good (0.4): Explains how stakeholders can improve the industry with coding knowledge. Provides 3 examples, though some may lack depth.
- Satisfactory (0.3): Mentions stakeholder impact but with limited explanation. Examples may not be fully relevant or clear.
- Needs Improvement (0.2): Limited discussion on stakeholders, coding knowledge, or examples. Ideas lack clarity.
- Poor (0.1): Does not discuss stakeholder impact or provide relevant examples.

2. Use of Coding Knowledge in Industry Improvement (0.5 marks max)

- Excellent (0.5): Demonstrates strong understanding of coding knowledge application. Examples are innovative and well-integrated.
- Good (0.4): Shows good understanding with relevant examples. Some minor gaps in explanation.
- Satisfactory (0.3): Shows some understanding but lacks depth. Examples may be generic.
- Needs Improvement (0.2): Limited understanding of how coding can improve industry. Examples are vague.
- Poor (0.1): No clear connection between coding knowledge and industry improvement.

3. Automation Proposal (0.5 marks max)

- Excellent (0.5): Clearly defines a relevant and innovative dataset for automation, explains the automation process effectively, and justifies its usefulness convincingly.
- Good (0.4): Defines a dataset for automation, explains its process, and justifies usefulness with some gaps.
- Satisfactory (0.3): Identifies a dataset but lacks detailed explanation or justification.
- Needs Improvement (0.2): Limited discussion on dataset automation. Explanation is unclear or incomplete.
- Poor (0.1): No meaningful discussion on dataset automation.

4. Citations and Referencing (0.5 marks max)

- Excellent (0.5): All sources are properly cited using a consistent referencing style.
- Good (0.4): Most sources are properly cited with minimal errors in style.

- Satisfactory (0.3): Some sources are cited, but there are inconsistencies or missing references.
- Needs Improvement (0.2): Few references provided or citation style is inconsistent.
- Poor (0.1): No references cited.

5. Grammar and Language (0.5 marks max)

- Excellent (0.5): Uses clear, professional, and grammatically correct language throughout.
- Good (0.4): Minor grammar or language issues but does not affect readability.
- Satisfactory (0.3): Some grammar or language mistakes that affect readability.
- Needs Improvement (0.2): Frequent grammar errors that hinder understanding.
- Poor (0.1): Poor grammar and unclear writing make the report unreadable.

6. Length and Formatting (0.5 marks max)

- Excellent (0.5): Adheres to the page limit, maintains proper formatting, and presents information concisely.
- Good (0.4): Adheres to the page limit but may have minor formatting issues.
- Satisfactory (0.3): Slightly exceeds or falls short of the page limit. Formatting may be inconsistent.
- Needs Improvement (0.2): Does not follow formatting guidelines; significantly exceeds or falls short of the page limit.
- Poor (0.1): Formatting is incorrect, and the length is far outside the requirements.

Total Score: ____ / 3

Grading Scale:

- 2.6 - 3.0: Excellent
- 2.1 - 2.5: Good
- 1.6 - 2.0: Satisfactory
- 1.0 - 1.5: Needs Improvement
- Below 1.0: Poor