Planning Proposal Marking Rubric

Introduction (20 marks)	**0 Marks**: No introduction provided or completely irrelevant.	**4 Marks**: Poor. Very vague or unclear background, problem statement, goals.	**8 Marks**: Minimal or vague background, problem statement, goals.	**12 Marks**: Basic background with some relevant context problem statement; mostly defined goals and objectives. Room for improvement.	**16 Marks**: Good introduction with well explained context; well-defined problem statement and goals that address the problem.	**20 Marks**: Excellent introduction; provides full context and relevance; clearly conveys the problem and its significance, goals and sub-goals that will clearly address the stated problem.
Methodology (20 marks).	**0 Marks**: No methodology provided or completely irrelevant.	**4 Marks**: Poor. Very vague or unrelated project approach; could lack detail on tools, technologies, and skills. New learning may be insufficient. If Research Project: Vague and poorly written literature review.	**8 Marks**: Minimal detail on project approach, ,tools, technologies & skills, or limited specific relevant to project. New learning may be insufficient. If Research Project: Minimal Literature review addressing general literature.	**12 Marks**: Basic project approach: mentions relevant tools and technologies, & skill. Lacks specific detail and depth. New learning is at the right level. If Research Project: Basic Literature review addressing	**16 Marks**: Good methodology, reasonable detail on project approach: justifies tools and technologies, & skill. New learning is at the right level. If Research Project: Detailed Literature review	**20 Marks**: Excellent methodology; comprehensive specific detail on project approach, tools, technologies, and skills to be gained. New learning is at the right level. If Research Project:

				relevant literature with some critique.	addressing relevant literature with reasonable critique.	Comprehensive Literature review addressing relevant literature with appropriate critique.
Deliverables (15 marks)	**0 Marks**: No deliverables or testing described, or completely irrelevant.	**3 Marks**: Poor. Minimal description of deliverables; unclear link to goals. Minimal outline of planned testing and validation.	**6 Marks**: Basic description of deliverables; some connection to goals. Brief outline of planned testing and validation.	**9 Marks**: Clear description of deliverables; mostly linked to goals. Reasonable outline of planned testing and validation.	**12 Marks**: Detailed description of deliverables; directly linked to most goals. Good outline of planned testing and validation.	**15 Marks**: Excellent description of deliverables; directly linked to all goals. Comprehensive outline of planned testing and validation.
Project Timeline (15 marks)	**0 Marks**: No timeline provided or completely irrelevant.	**3 Marks**: Poor. Very vague timeline; unclear milestones.	**6 Marks**: Basic timeline with some milestones; lacks clarity in task breakdown.	**9 Marks**: Clear timeline with reasonable milestones and task breakdown.	**12 Marks**: Detailed timeline; all deadlines clear;	**15 Marks**: Excellent timeline; all deadlines clear, well-structured,
Risk Management Plan (10 marks)	**0 Marks**: No risk management plan provided or completely irrelevant.	**2 Marks**: Poor. Minimal identification of risks; no mitigation strategies.	**4 Marks**: Basic identification of risks; vague or limited mitigation strategies.	**6 Marks**: Clear identification of several risks; some relevant mitigation strategies.	**8 Marks**: Detailed identification of risks; comprehensive mitigation strategies and contingency plans.	**10 Marks**: Excellent risk management plan; thoroughly identifies risks with effective mitigation strategies and contingency plans.

Presentation, Clarity & References (10 marks)	0 Marks: Very poor presentation; numerous errors in writing.	2 Marks: Poor presentation quality; many writing errors. None or incorrectly formatted references.	4 Marks: Unsatisfactory presentation; unclear, vague writing. None or incorrectly formatted references.	6 Marks: Reasonable presentation; few errors in writing; mostly organised.	8 Marks: Well-presented; writing is clear and mostly error-free. References and in-text citations have been used.	10 Marks: Excellent presentation; writing is clear, concise, and free from errors; very professional. All tables and images are labelled. References and in-text citations have been used and are in APA format.