

Marking Rubric (Total: 5 Marks)

1. Understanding of Stakeholder Impact (1.5 marks max)

- **Excellent (1.5):** Clearly explains how stakeholders can improve the industry with coding knowledge. Provides at least 3 relevant and well-explained examples.
- **Good (1.2):** Explains how stakeholders can improve the industry with coding knowledge. Provides 3 examples, though some may lack depth.
- **Satisfactory (0.9):** Mentions stakeholder impact but with limited explanation. Examples may not be fully relevant or clear.
- **Needs Improvement (0.6):** Limited discussion on stakeholders, coding knowledge, or examples. Ideas lack clarity.
- **Poor (0.3):** Does not discuss stakeholder impact or provide relevant examples.

2. Use of Coding Knowledge in Industry Improvement (1.5 marks max)

- **Excellent (1.5):** Demonstrates strong understanding of coding knowledge application. Examples are innovative and well-integrated.
- **Good (1.2):** Shows good understanding with relevant examples. Some minor gaps in explanation.
- **Satisfactory (0.9):** Shows some understanding but lacks depth. Examples may be generic.
- **Needs Improvement (0.6):** Limited understanding of how coding can improve industry. Examples are vague.
- **Poor (0.3):** No clear connection between coding knowledge and industry improvement.

3. Automation Proposal (1 mark max)

- **Excellent (1.0):** Clearly defines a relevant and innovative dataset for automation, explains the automation process effectively, and justifies its usefulness convincingly.
- **Good (0.8):** Defines a dataset for automation, explains its process, and justifies usefulness with some gaps.
- **Satisfactory (0.6):** Identifies a dataset but lacks detailed explanation or justification.

- **Needs Improvement (0.4):** Limited discussion on dataset automation. Explanation is unclear or incomplete.
- **Poor (0.2):** 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.

Total Score: ____ / 5

Grading Scale:

- **4.3 - 5.0:** Excellent
- **3.5 - 4.2:** Good
- **2.5 - 3.4:** Satisfactory
- **1.5 - 2.4:** Needs Improvement
- **Below 1.5:** Poor