ICT201 IT Project Management S1-2023

Assignment I – Project Proposal

Grade Report

Student Name: Jin Chong

Overview of the student's Score:

1. Project Charter (25%)		3. Project Management Plan (40%)		3. Work Breakdown Structure (35%)		Total	Number of days late	Deduction	Mark out of 20%
Content	Clarity & Logic	Content	Clarity & Logic	Content	Clarity & Logic				
20%	5%	35%	5%	30%	5%	100%			
18	**5**	**20**	**3**	**22**	**4**	**72%**	**-**	**-**	**14.4**

General Scoring and Rubric Comments:

Deliverable	Part	New Level	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Poor
Project Charter **25%**	Content 20%	**20-19%** Covers all the sections explicitly provided in the template and workshop discussions. Included ALL pertinent information about the project. Goes beyond the information provided and considers the real-world implications when developing the content. Clear, well-thought-out, easy-to-read, and short dot-point sentences are provided throughout. All sections are complete.	**18-15%** Covers most sections provided in the template and workshop discussions. Included most pertinent information about the project. Goes beyond the information provided and considers the real-world implications. Clear, easy-to-read sentences and short dot-point sentences. All sections are complete.	**14 - 10%** Covers many aspects provided in the template and workshop discussions. Included most pertinent information about the project. Limited evidence to support going beyond the information provided. Practical implications were not sufficiently considered. Many clear sentences and short dot-point sentences. Most sections are complete.	**9 - 5%** Many sections provided in the template and workshop discussions were not included. Included most pertinent information in the solution. Did not go beyond the information provided. Practical/real-world implications were not considered. Difficult to read and incomplete in many sections.	**4 - 0%** Covers little to no aspects provided in the template and workshop discussions. Included little to no pertinent information about the project. Does not go beyond the information provided. Mostly incomplete and difficult to read.
	Clarity & Logic 5%	**5%** Logical, readily understandable, and well-written throughout. Skilfully developed with cohesion and consistency. Language choices are appropriate, imaginative, and compelling and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Correct naming. Practical and well-structured overall.	**4%** Mostly logical, understandable, and well-written sections. A few clarity and consistency issues in some sections. Language choices are appropriate and support the effectiveness of the presentation. Correct naming. Mostly practical and well-structured.	**3%** Many logical, readily understandable, and well-written sections. Many clarity and consistency issues in several sections. Language choices are mundane and commonplace but appropriate to the audience. Incorrect naming. Lack of practicality and structure.	**2%** Looks illogical, and many sections are difficult to understand. Most sections are not well written. Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Incorrect naming. May lack practicality and structure in most sections.	**1-0%** Poorly organised and difficult to understand. Lacks logic and practicality throughout. The overall delivery technique is poor, including the language and structure of the document.

Deliverable	Part	New Level	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Poor
Project Management Plan **40%**	**Content** **35%**	**35-30%** Provides a comprehensive framework that explains the project and delivers an overview of the approach that will be used. Provides in-depth descriptions of how the project will be managed. Covers all the sections explicitly provided in the template and workshop discussions. Included ALL pertinent information for managing this project. Goes beyond the information provided and considers real-world implications.	**29-24%** Provides a framework that mostly explains the project and delivers an overview of the approach that will be used. Provides sufficient descriptions of how the project will be managed. Covers most sections explicitly provided in the template and workshop discussions. Included the most (but not all) pertinent information for managing this project. Attempts to go beyond the information provided and considers real-world implications.	**23-18%** Provides a framework that generally explains the project and delivers an overview of the approach to meet the objectives successfully. Provides few details and descriptions of how the project will be managed. Covers many sections explicitly provided in the template and workshop discussions. Included some pertinent information. Does not go beyond the information provided and limited consideration for practical implications.	**17-12%** Provides a very broad framework that explains the project and its approach. Covers some sections (but not all) provided in the template and workshop discussions. Included some useful information but overlooks pertinent matters. Does not go beyond the information provided nor considers the practical implications involved.	**11-0%** Provides a weak framework that does not necessarily explain the project and how it could be managed. A lot of pertinent information is not provided. Real-world implications not considered
	Clarity & Logic **5%**	**5%** Logical, readily understandable, and well-written throughout. Skilfully developed with cohesion and consistency. Language choices are appropriate, imaginative, and compelling and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Correct naming. Practical and well-structured overall.	**4%** Mostly logical, understandable, and well-written sections. A few clarity and consistency issues in some sections. Language choices are appropriate and support the effectiveness of the presentation. Correct naming. Mostly practical and well-structured.	**3%** Many logical, readily understandable, and well-written sections. Many clarity and consistency issues in several sections. Language choices are mundane and commonplace but appropriate to the audience. Incorrect naming. Lack of practicality and structure.	**2%** Looks illogical, and many sections are difficult to understand. Most sections are not well written. Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Incorrect naming. May lack practicality and structure in most sections.	**1-0%** Poorly organised and difficult to understand. Lacks logic and practicality throughout. The overall delivery technique is poor, including the language and structure of the document.

Deliverable	Part	New Level	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Poor
Work Breakdown Structure **35%**	**Content** **30%**	**30-26%** Clearly followed the six key steps provided to complete the WBS (comprehensively). Provided a complete list of activities and milestones in the project with appropriate naming. Identified other activities that reflect real-world practical realities. Provides a complete sequencing of activities (all predecessors included). The dependencies are well defined and realistic/practical. Considered different types of possible dependencies. The WBS is complete.	**25-22%** Followed the six key steps provided to complete the WBS (generally). Provided most of the workstreams, activities and milestones involved in the project. Provides the sequence for most activities but not all. Most dependencies are well defined and realistic/practical. Considered different types of possible dependencies. The WBS is mostly complete.	**21-15%** Followed some of the six key steps provided to complete the WBS. Provided many of the project workstreams, activities, and milestones, but many others are not included. The activity sequencing provided is practical but incomplete. Activity dependencies are not well articulated, and some maybe unrealistic. Considered some types of dependencies but many possible types were overlooked. The WBS is incomplete.	**14 - 10%** Did not followed all the six key steps provided to complete the WBS (generally). Included only some workstreams, activities, and milestones (incomplete scope of work). Incomplete activity sequencing such that not all predecessors were included. Many dependencies are unrealistic/impractical. Possible dependence types were not considered.	**9-0%** Did not follow the recommended steps. Included only a few workstreams, activities, and milestones (very limited scope of work provided). Major issues with activity sequencing – missing most predecessors. The different dependencies were not considered.
	Clarity & Logic **5%**	**5%** Provides a logical flow of all workstreams in the entry table. The activity sequence is sound. Activity names are clear, precise, and meaningful. Language choice is appropriate to the audience. The project will start and finish within the planned formal start and closure dates.	**4%** The flow of activities in most workstreams is mostly logical. The activity sequence is sound. Activity names are meaningful. Language choice is appropriate to the audience. The project will start and finish within the planned formal start and closure dates.	**3%** Provides a logical flow of activities, but not all workstreams are included. The activity sequencing is sound for most workstreams though not all. Language choice is somewhat appropriate. The project will start and finish within the planned formal start and finish dates.	**2%** Some issues with the overall organisation and activity listing. The flow of activities and workstreams is illogical in most cases. Missing some workstreams and activities. The project was not planned within formal start and closure dates.	**1-0%** Poorly organised workstreams and activities. No logical flow of activities. Poor language choice. Poor activity naming. Unsound activity sequencing. Overall project start and finish lie outside the planned dates.