Assignment 1 Rubrics – Semester 1, 2023

The following rubric will be used to assess and articulate the expectations for this assignment.

Assessment Area	Poor Argument	Fair Argument	Good Argument	Very Good Argument	Excellent Argument
Q1 – Business Case **2 MARKS**	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Reducing operational overheads not discussed. Only mention of I.T. system **(1 Mark)**	Reducing operational overheads not mentioned. New I.T. system mentioned with other benefits **(1.5 Marks)**	Comprehensive arguments that mention reducing operational overheads as well as development of new I.T. system. Other benefits may be discussed but not necessary **(2 Marks)**
Q2 – Project Risks **2 Risks X 3 Marks Each** **6 MARKS**	Not Applicable	Poor risk statements. Risk does not applicable to the case study or the relationship vague. Probability and Impact for risk missing, or not appropriate for the risk. Weak justifications for one or more risks. **(1 Mark)**	Fair risk statements but does not address two or more variables of Action-Consequence-Impact. Valid allocations for Probability and Impact. Fair justification for one or more risks, but arguments do not incorporate the rationale for both the Probability and Impact. **(2 Mark)**	Good risk statements but does not address one variable of Action-Consequence-Impact. Valid allocations for Probability and Impact. Good justifications for both risks but does not incorporate the rationale for both the Probability and Impact allocations. **(2.5 Marks)**	Comprehensive risk statements addressing Action-Consequence-Impact for both risks. Valid allocations for Probability and Impact. Excellent justifications for both risks, clearly explaining the rationale for allocating the Probability and Impact, holistically as related to the case study needs **(3 Marks)**
Q3 – SDLC Recommendation **2 SDLC X 6 Marks Each** **12 MARKS**	Poor, incoherent, and inconsistent arguments. Arguments are not clear in their relation, either to a specific SDLC feature, or to a specific	Fair arguments with multiple inconsistencies. Arguments weakly related to the choice of	Good arguments for SDLC choice. The arguments to justify WHAT expectations of the SDLC choice is addressed but	Very good arguments for SDLC choice. WHAT expectations for the choice of SDLC clearly articulated.	Excellent arguments for SDLC choice. WHAT expectations for the choice of SDLC clearly articulated.

Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology (FEIT)
School of Computing and Information Systems (CIS)

requirement of the case study. Justifications are generic and not related to a specific SDLC feature (addressing the WHAT expectation), or to the needs of the case study. No connect in the arguments between SDLC capabilities and specific project needs (addressing the HOW expectations). No rationale on how the capabilities apply to the current case study (addressing the WHY expectations) References missing. Multiple grammatical and formatting errors. **(2 Marks)**	SDLC choice considering the SDLC capabilities. Justifications are generic when addressing the WHAT, HOW and WHY expectations for the choice made, with no references to specific requirements. Justifications are generic and missing two or more of WHAT, HOW and WHY expectations for the choice made. References do not follow recommended style or missing. Multiple grammatical and formatting errors. **(3 Marks)**	arguments are incomplete. Vague, unclear, or missing arguments for the HOW and WHY expectations for SDLC choice. Good choice of references but inconsistencies in style. Link back to case study section missing. Overall Justifications are good, but inconsistencies are observed in the connect to SDLC needs. Minor grammatical and formatting errors. **(4 Marks)**	HOW expectations for choice of SDLC clearly articulated. Vague, missing or unclear arguments for WHY expectations for choice of SDLC. Overall arguments are well written addressing multiple dimensions of the WHAT – HOW – WHY expectations, but not all three addressed and few unclear arguments overall. Valid references support the arguments made in choice of SDLC. References link to case study sections. Minimal grammatical and formatting errors. **(5 Marks)**	HOW expectations for the choice of SDLC clearly articulated. WHY expectations for the choice of SDLC clearly articulated. Justifications are holistic in the capabilities of the SDLC model that satisfies the needs of this project from the WHAT – HOW – WHY dimensions. Valid references that clearly support the arguments in choice of the SDLC. References link to case study sections. No grammatical and formatting errors. **(6 Marks)**