|  | **Presentation**  **20%** | **Project Schedule**  **15%** | **Cost/Benefit Analysis**  **15%** | **Risk Assessment**  **10%** | **Quality Assurance Plan**  **10%** | **HRM Plan**  **10%** | **Development Options**  **10%** | **Report Structure**  **10%** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0-9% | No presentation provided. | No schedule provided. | No cost/benefit analysis provided. | No risk assessment provided. | No quality assurance plan provided. | No attempt to develop an HRM plan. | No attempt to compare different development options. | No attempt at presentation and formatting. |
| 10-19% | Inaudible, spoken very quickly. No pausing, or very short presentation. | Limited attempt to define some activities with incorrect times and relationships. No breakdown, flow or critical path analysis. | Limited definition of costs. | Limited risk analysis without probability and impact analysis or no meaningful mitigation strategy. | Limited attempt to develop a quality assurance plan without mentioning any responsibility and control. | Limited attempt to develop an HRM plan without or with limited responsibility matrix and recommendations. | An attempt to compare different development options but its incomplete or incorrect. | Very little attempt made at presentation and formatting. |
| 20-29% | Difficult to understand presentation. No pausing, or very short presentation. | Some project activities offered, but key ones are missing. Incorrect WBS and/or critical path analysis. | Incoherent articulation of costs. | Incorrect or illogical risks are identified without probability and impact analysis or no meaningful mitigation strategy. | Incorrect and/or non-logical quality criteria. Responsibilities and control techniques are either missing or incomplete. | An organisational chart is developed but is incomplete. Responsibility matrix and recommendations are missing or incomplete. | Limited attempt to compare different development options without a meaningful recommendation. | Very unorganised report with several missing features. |
| 30-39% | Presentation is very difficult to follow. No pausing, or very short presentation. | Main activities are presented in a logical way. Incorrect WBS and/or critical path analysis. | Little or no identification of costs/benefits, no cost/benefit analysis, no conclusion on cost/benefit analysis. | Some risks mentioned. Probability and impact confused and no meaningful mitigation strategy. | The quality criteria are limited and/or incomplete. Responsibilities and control techniques are either missing or incomplete. | An organisational chart is developed but is not well-justified. Responsibility matrix and recommendations are missing or incomplete. | Limited attempt to compare different development options. Some general recommendations are made. | Only a few basic features of a professional report are considered. |
| 40-49% | Able to hear presentation, Some pausing, short presentation or over one minute overtime. | Appropriate project activities presented, but only high-level breakdown, flow and critical path analysis. | Basic articulation of some costs but not related to work breakdown structure. Some analysis as to whether the project is advisable. | Some risks mentioned & well-articulated. Limited attempt to treat risks in a structured, methodical way. | Some quality criteria are mentioned in your report and an attempt is made to present some responsibilities and control techniques are either missing or incomplete. | An organisational chart is developed but is incomplete. Responsibility matrix and recommendations are either missing or incomplete. | Limited attempts have been made to compare different development options but they are not related or justified using evidence from the case study. | Not presented as a professional report. Lacking page number, appropriate headings, etc. Or lots of grammatical errors. |
| 50-59% | Clear voice, well-paced delivery with good use of voice, tone, and pausing. Presentation goes overtime or under time (up to one minute). | Appropriate project activities presented, a reasonable level of details in product breakdown, project network and critical path analysis. | Good articulation of tangible costs in a relationship with work breakdown structure. No cost/benefit analysis presented. | Some risks mentioned & well-articulated. Clear attempt to treat risks in a structured, methodical way. | A complete set of quality criteria is presented. Some attempts made to discuss responsibilities and control techniques. | A complete organisational chart is presented. Some attempts made to create a responsibility matrix and few recommendations are made. | Different development options are compared using evidence from the case study but a recommendation is missing. | Presented as a report. Few key features are missing. |
| 60-69% | Effective and interesting delivery, well-paced delivery with good use of voice, tone, and pausing. Complete presentation in a timely manner but rushed or slowing to set time. | Appropriate project activities presented, supported by appropriately details breakdown, network and critical path analysis. | Good articulation of tangible costs in a relationship with work breakdown structure.  One cost/benefit analysis technique is used but not correctly / completely. | Key risks mentioned & well-articulated. Strong attempt to treat risks in a structured, methodical way. | A complete set of quality criteria is presented. Responsibilities and control techniques are explained but not well-justified. | A complete organisational chart is presented. A responsibility matrix and few recommendations are developed but they are not related with each other. | Different development options are compared using evidence from the case study but a recommendation is not based on evidence from the case study. | Presented as a report. Few major formatting and/or grammatical errors. |
| 70-79% | Effective and interesting delivery, well-paced delivery with good use of voice, tone, and pausing. Content could be better organised in slides. | Detailed and logical activities presented, supported by appropriately details breakdown, flow, critical path analysis and the network of activities. | Good articulation of tangible and intangible costs in a relationship with the work breakdown structure.  One cost/benefit analysis technique is used correctly with appropriate conclusions given. | Key risks identified and well-articulated. Risk treatment creative, effective and clearly presented in a structured, methodical way. | A complete set of quality criteria is presented. Responsibilities and control techniques are explained. An attempt has been made to justify these criteria in the context of the case organisation. | A complete organisational chart is presented and positions are justified. A responsibility matrix and few recommendations are developed but they are not related with each other. | Different development options are compared using evidence from the case study and a recommendation is made but it is not well justified. | Presented as a report. Few minor formatting and/or grammatical errors. |
| 80-89% | Informative, well-paced delivery, good use of pausing. Complete presentation within 15 seconds of time limit without being rushed or slowing. | Well prepared project activities presented, supported by appropriately details breakdown, flow, critical path analysis and the network of activities. | Good articulation of tangible and intangible costs and benefits in a relationship with the work breakdown structure.  One cost/benefit analysis technique is used correctly with appropriate conclusions given. | Key risks identified and well-articulated through their possibility and impact. Risk treatment creative, effective and clearly presented in a structured, methodical way. | Complete quality criteria, responsibilities and control techniques are presented and discussed in the context of the case study. | Complete organisational chart and responsibility matrix are presented. Comprehensive recommendations are made and all components are related to each other. | Complete and logical comparison and recommendation presented and discussed in the context of the case study. | Very good presentation, clear report structure, all report features are evident. Very good use of language. |
| 90-100% | Exceptional presentation. Effectively delivered and supported by visual aids and well-prepared slides. | Exceptional project schedule using a planning software in great details supported by breakdown, flow, critical path analysis and the network of activities. | Exceptional and logical definition of costs and benefits. Detailed and well-presented cost/benefit analysis. | Exceptional risk analysis with a clear assessment of probability and impact. Informative and methodical treatment for each risk. | Exceptional and detailed quality criteria, responsibilities and control techniques are presented and discussed in the context of the case study. | Complete organisational chart and responsibility matrix are presented. Comprehensive recommendations are made and all components are related to each other. All recommendations are justified. | Excellent comparison and recommendation presented and discussed in the context of the case study. Further references are used to find the best solution. | Excellent presentation, clear report structure, all report features are evident. Excellent use of language. |