Rubric for Innovative Project Proposal and Evaluation

Grading rubric for a Group Project Proposal and the System Analysis and Design Deliverable Rubric

Project Proposal Components	Project Proposal Project Element Ratings			
	Sophisticated (8-10)	**Competent** (7-8)	**Adequate** (5-6)	**Not Adequate** (0-4)
Problem Statement (10 marks)	• Clear focus, and an extremely comprehensive explanation of the problem, student proposes a purposeful and reasonable response. • The introduction is engaging, states the problem, provides a context for the study and previews the project's structure in detail	• There is a clear focus, and a developed explanation of the problem, student has proposed a reasonable response. • The introduction states the problem, provides a context for the study and previews the structure of the Project.	• The area of focus is too broad or narrow. does not clearly make a explanation of the problem. • The introduction states problem, but does not provide a context for the study.	• There is no clear focus for the project. No case has been made that a problem exists. An underdeveloped response is proposed. • No clear intro., or problem statement or structure of the Project.
Subject Knowledge And Supporting Material (10 marks)	•The deliverable demonstrated knowledge and skills by integrating major and minor concepts into the response. •The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking about the topic. •All relevant information was obtained and information sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were well supported by the information.	•The deliverable demonstrated skill and knowledge by integrating major concepts into the response. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of limited research effort and/or initial of thinking about the topic. Sufficient information was obtained and most sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were mostly supported by the information	• Makes an attempt to connect the study to existing research, however multiple sources cited do not relate to the problem or proposed solution. • Most of the references are from sources that are not peer reviewed and have uncertain reliability. The reader doubts the accuracy of the material.	•The deliverable did not demonstrate knowledge of the content, evidence of the research effort or depth of thinking about the topic. Insufficient information was obtained and/or sources lack validity. •Analysis and design considerations were not supported by the information collected.
Contribution (10 marks)	All requirements and objectives are identified, evaluated and competed. The deliverable offered new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Likewise, the application is based on stated criteria, analysis and constraints.	All requirements are identified and evaluated but some objectives are not completed. The deliverable offered some new information or approach to the topic under discussion. The application is reasonable; further analysis of some of the alternatives or constraints may have led to a different recommendation.	Not all requirements are identified and evaluated with some objectives are not completed. The deliverable does not offer new information or approach to the topic under discussion. The application is reasonable; limited or no further analysis of some of the alternatives .	Many requirements and objectives are not identified, evaluated and/or completed. The deliverable offered no new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Few application considerations are analysed and other factors were ignored or incompletely analysed.
Proposed Project Plan (15 marks)	• Action is *insightfully* outlined in light of several relevant research & best practice elements. • High level of awareness of culture and context is given to the action plan. • Clear anticipation of Resources including finance and potential challenges are addressed.	• Action is outlined in light of relevant research & best practice. • Some awareness of culture and context is indicated in the action plan. • Clear anticipation of Resources including and potential challenges are addressed.	• Several action steps are outlined in light relevant research & best practice. • Little awareness of culture and context is indicated in the action plan. • Some anticipation of resources and	• Action steps are not outlined in light of relevant educational research & best practice. Action steps have been missed. • Little awareness of culture and context is indicated in the

	• Detailed timetable with milestones. Description of task phases (typical development tasks: Planning, Concept Development, System-Level Design, Detailed Design, Testing and Refinement) • Division of duties and responsibilities among team members. • Timeline with milestones using Gantt chart	•Timetable with milestones. Not complete description of task phases . Division of duties and responsibilities among team members are not well defined or equitable . Timeline with milestones using Gantt chart	potential challenges are addressed. • No Timetable with milestones. No complete description of task phases. • Division of duties and responsibilities among team members are not well defined or equitable . No Timeline with milestones using Gantt chart	action plan. • Some needed resources and/or potential challenges have been missed. • No Timetable with milestones. No complete description of task phases. • Division of duties and responsibilities among team members are not well defined or equitable • No Timeline with milestones using Gantt chart
Composition (5 marks)	The deliverable was well organized and clearly written. The underlying logic was clearly articulated and easy to follow. Words were chosen that precisely expressed the intended meaning and supported reader comprehension. Diagrams or analyses enhanced and clarified presentation of ideas. Sentences were grammatical and free from errors.	The deliverable was organized and clearly written for the most part. In some areas the logic and/or flow of ideas were difficult to follow. Words were well chosen with some minor expectations. Diagrams were consistent with the text. Sentences were mostly grammatical and/or only a few spelling errors were present but they did not hinder the reader.	The deliverable was organized but not clearly defined for the most part. In some areas the logic and/or flow of ideas were difficult to follow. Words were not well chosen with some minor expectations. Diagrams were not always consistent with the text. Sentences were mostly grammatical correct with few spelling errors but they did not hinder the reader understanding	The deliverable lacked overall organization. The reader had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. Diagrams were absent or inconsistent with the text. Grammatical and spelling errors made it difficult for the reader to interpret the text in places.