TechLauncher 2025 Sprint Marking Rubric

Overview

TechLauncher is structured around six sprints. Students are required to attend their assigned sprint days and actively contribute to team activities. At the end of each sprint, teams should review their contributions with their tutor. At the end of the semester, each team must submit a **Sprint Grade Case**, which, together with tutor observations, determines the final Sprint mark.

General Flow

- Tutors **meet with each team** every week for approximately 30 minutes and observe teams during the day as they work in The Hive. **Students are expected to attend for eight hours a day** on each of the three days that form a single sprint.

- At the end of each sprint, students are expected to walk through their sprint work with tutors, addressing all relevant aspects of the rubric criteria. This is a chance to review your work, clarify questions, and receive feedback. Students may refer to the *Sprint Checklist* available on Wattle for possible items to discuss during this meeting.

- Students will **not receive marks after each sprint.** Instead, tutors will provide an indicative grade band and feedback to guide the progress.

- At the end of the semester, each team should submit a **Sprint Grade Case** summarising their progress and contributions across all three sprints. The submission must explicitly state the overall grade being requested, and indicate the grade bands the team believes are met for each rubric criterion. Please refer to the *Sprint Grade Case template* on Wattle for full details.

- Each student must submit the **Team Contribution Form individually** on Wattle after each sprint (due the same day as their sprint review) and after the Sprint Grade Case (due the same day as the Grade Case submission).

Attendance and Participation

Attendance is a core expectation of Sprint participation. There will be 9 sprint days where your full-day attendance is required. These days collectively contribute to your final 30% sprint grade. Valid reasons (e.g. illness or emergencies) should be supported by evidence and communicated to your tutor in advance wherever possible.

Unexplained absences will result in the following deductions from the final Sprint mark:

- For each day of absence, **3 marks** will be deducted from your final sprint score (out of 30).
- *Example*: If your original Sprint mark is 22 and you miss part of a day, your final mark will be reduced to 19.
- These deductions apply individually, not to the team's overall performance.

Marking Rubric

This rubric is intended to help students understand expectations for each performance level. It is used to provide sprint feedback and to assess the Sprint Grade Case. **Meeting all requirements to a high standard reflects a Distinction level.** A High Distinction is awarded for work that goes beyond expectations and demonstrates exceptional quality.

For any questions about marks or feedback, please contact your tutor. Tutors can provide clarification and make adjustments if needed.

Teams with an external (to the team) stakeholder

	HD (High Distinction): 80 - 100%	D (Distinction): 70 - 79%	CR (Credit): 60 - 69%	P (Pass): 50 - 59%	N (Fail): <50%
Stakeholder Engagement (20%)	Proactive engagement with key stakeholders; Exceptional communication and fully effective practices to manage expectations and improve relationships	Consistent engagement with key stakeholders; strong communication and mostly effective practices to manage expectations and relationships	Regular engagement with key stakeholders; clear communication and generally effective practices to manage expectations and relationships	Occasional engagement with key stakeholders; adequate communication and somewhat effective practices to manage expectations and relationships	Minimal engagement with key stakeholders; limited practices in place to manage stakeholder expectations or improve relationships
Planning and Organisation (20%)	Well-considered and strategic planning, with use of fully effective estimates; Progress, risks, and responsibilities are actively monitored, reviewed, and refined throughout the sprint	Clear and realistic planning, with use of mostly effective estimates; Progress, risks, and responsibilities are consistently monitored with minor gaps	Clear and reasonable planning, with generally effective estimates; Progress, risks, and responsibilities are monitored with some gaps	A plan exists but is unclear or not fully realistic; Estimations are inaccurate or inconsistently applied. Monitoring of progress, risks, and responsibilities is irregular or superficial	Little or no evidence of effective planning. Estimations are absent or poorly considered. No meaningful monitoring of progress, risks, or responsibilities

Execution and Quality (40%)	Tasks are executed with exceptional quality and completed on time or with clear justification. Work delivers exceptional value to stakeholders, demonstrates steady progress, and adapts effectively to all unforeseen issues or changes in scope	Tasks are executed with high quality and completed on time or with clear justification. Work delivers strong value to stakeholders, demonstrates consistent effort, and responds effectively to most challenges	Tasks are executed with satisfactory quality, with some delays or inconsistencies. Work delivers reasonable value to stakeholders, shows mostly steady effort, and responds to challenges with some effectiveness	Tasks are executed with basic quality and are occasionally below expectations, with frequent delays or inconsistencies. Work delivers limited value to stakeholders, shows uneven effort, and responds to challenges with limited success	Tasks are rarely completed to an acceptable standard or left incomplete. Work delivers little or no value to stakeholders, shows minimal effort, and fails to address challenges effectively
Reflection and Improvement (20%)	Insightful and critical reflection; feedback from stakeholders and the team is proactively sought, thoroughly considered, with consistently effective improvements in practices	Constructive reflection; feedback from stakeholders and the team is actively collected and acted on when appropriate, with mostly effective improvements in practices	Purposeful reflection; feedback from stakeholders and the team is occasionally collected and acted on, with some improvement in practices	Basic reflection; feedback from stakeholders and the team is sometimes acknowledged or incorporated, with limited evidence of improvement in practices	Little or no evidence of reflection, feedback use, or efforts to improve practices, learning, or project outcomes

Student-Led Teams (without an external stakeholder)

	HD (High Distinction): 80 - 100%	D (Distinction): 70 - 79%	CR (Credit): 60 - 69%	P (Pass): 50 - 59%	N (Fail): <50%
Planning and Organisation (25%)	Well-considered and strategic planning, with use of fully effective estimates; Progress, risks, and responsibilities are actively monitored, reviewed, and refined throughout the sprint	Clear and realistic planning, with use of mostly effective estimates; Progress, risks, and responsibilities are consistently monitored with minor gaps	Clear and reasonable planning, with generally effective estimates; Progress, risks, and responsibilities are monitored with some gaps	A plan exists but is unclear or not fully realistic; Estimations are inaccurate or inconsistently applied. Monitoring of progress, risks, and responsibilities is irregular or superficial	Little or no evidence of effective planning. Estimations are absent or poorly considered. No meaningful monitoring of progress, risks, or responsibilities
Execution and Quality (50%)	Tasks are executed with exceptional quality and completed on time or with clear justification. Work delivers exceptional value to stakeholders, demonstrates steady progress, and adapts effectively to all unforeseen issues or changes in scope	Tasks are executed with high quality and completed on time or with clear justification. Work delivers strong value to stakeholders, demonstrates consistent effort, and responds effectively to most challenges	Tasks are executed with satisfactory quality, with some delays or inconsistencies. Work delivers reasonable value to stakeholders, shows mostly steady effort, and responds to challenges with some effectiveness	Tasks are executed with basic quality and are occasionally below expectations, with frequent delays or inconsistencies. Work delivers limited value to stakeholders, shows uneven effort, and responds to challenges with limited success	Tasks are rarely completed to an acceptable standard or left incomplete. Work delivers little or no value to stakeholders, shows minimal effort, and fails to address challenges effectively

Reflection and Improvement (25%)	Insightful and critical reflection; feedback from stakeholders and the team is proactively sought, thoroughly considered, with consistently effective improvements in practices	Constructive reflection; feedback from stakeholders and the team is actively collected and acted on when appropriate, with mostly effective improvements in practices	Purposeful reflection; feedback from stakeholders and the team is occasionally collected and acted on, with some improvement in practices	Basic reflection; feedback from stakeholders and the team is sometimes acknowledged or incorporated, with limited evidence of improvement in practices	Little or no evidence of reflection, feedback use, or efforts to improve practices, learning, or project outcomes