Project assessment rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Emerging** [1] | **Expected** [2] | **Exceeding** [3] |  |
| **Purpose**  Project diary: Day 3  Task: The prototype | The problem or the audience are not clearly defined. The proposed design is not particularly well suited to address the problem or match the audience. | The problem and the audience are clearly defined. The proposed design seems to address the problem and match the audience. | The problem and the audience are clearly defined. The proposed design is original and/or especially well-considered for the problem and audience. |  |
| **Design**  Project diary: Day 3  Task: The prototype | The description of the functionality or how it is achieved is incomplete. Input, processing, and output are not appropriately used in the description. | There is a complete description of the functionality and how it is achieved in terms of inputs, processing, and outputs. | There is a detailed, decomposed description of the functionality and how it is achieved in terms of inputs, processing, and outputs. Sketches or diagrams are also employed. |  |
| **Implementation**  Evaluate prototype | The prototype is not fully functional. Features are missing, or not working as expected. | The prototype works as expected, providing the intended functionality. | The prototype works as expected, possibly providing extended features. It is evident that extra effort has been put into construction or usability.  **Note**: Allocate additional points for code that is well-documented and/or especially elegant. |  |
| **Ambition**  Evaluate prototype | The implemented functionality is too simple for the time provided. The underlying program does not go beyond the elementary patterns supplied in the introductory lessons. | The implemented functionality is realistic, given the time constraints. The underlying program successfully combines different programming constructs to achieve the goal. | The implemented functionality is beyond expectations, given the time constraints. |  |
| **Feedback**  Project diary: Days 1 and 2  Task: Feedback | Recording of peer feedback and response to it is incomplete or cursory. | Peer feedback has been recorded, along with a response to the individual feedback points. | Peer feedback has been recorded. The response is appropriate for the feedback and, where valid feedback has been received, the response indicates how it will lead to improvements in the project. |  |
| **Evaluation**  Project diary: Day 3  Task: Self-reflection | The self-reflection is incomplete or cursory. | The self-reflection contains a complete description of at least one problem and one top tip. | The self-reflection is thorough and insightful. The problems, solutions, and suggestions indicate that useful knowledge and experience has been obtained through the project.  **Note**: This is especially important for projects where the implementation is not fully functional. Learners will be able to balance their assessment if they have been able to document/explain the problems that led to such an outcome. |  |

Resources are updated regularly — the latest version is available at: [ncce.io/tcc](http://ncce.io/tcc).
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