ICT201 IT Project Management
Assignment 2 – Project Control and Management
Grade Report

Group Member: **Jin Chong**

Marks for each document and total mark for the group

EVM Analysis (10%)	Quality Management Plan (QMP) (30%)	Communication Plan (30%)	Risk Management Plan (25%)	PCR (5%)	Total (100%)	Days Late / Penalty	Total after Penalty	Mark out of 20%
7	26	29	20	5	87	-	-	17.4

Scoring for the content presented in each document

EVM Cost Analysis	Max Score 10%	Quality Management Plan (QMP)	Max Score 30%
Analysis of cost and schedule variances (**4 marks**)	2	2. Project Scope (**3 marks**)	2
Analysis of implications and recommendations (**4 marks**)	3	3. Project Quality Overview (**5 marks**)	5
Clarity & logic (**2 marks**)	2	4. Project Quality Management Methodology (**6 marks**)	5
Total	**7**	5. Project quality standards (**6 marks**)	4
Communication Plan	**Max Score 30%**	6. Project Testing (**5 marks**)	5
2. Project Scope (**3 marks**)	2	Clarity & logic (**5 marks**)	5
3. Organisational Structure & Coordination (**5 marks**)	5	**Total**	**26**
4. Working Groups (**5 marks**)	5	**Risk Management Plan (RMP)**	**Max Score 25%**
5.1. Formal Meetings (**6 marks**)	6	2. Project Scope (**3 marks**)	2
5.2. Formal Reporting (**6 marks**)	6	5.1. Task 1 (Risk Register) (**10 marks**)	7
Clarity & logic (**5 marks**)	5	5.2. Task 2 (EMV) (**7 marks**)	7
Total	**29**	Clarity & logic (**5 marks**)	4
		Total	**20**

Detailed scores and rubric comments:

Deliverable	Part	New Level	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Poor
EVM Cost Analysis (10%)	**Content** **8%**	**8%** Covers ALL calculations, implication, and recommendations explicitly as required in the EVM analysis. No calculation errors. Clear evidence to support going beyond the information provided and thought about the real-world implications when explaining the implications and recommendations. Clear, well-thought-out, easy-to-read sentences are developed, and short dot-point sentences are provided throughout. All sections are complete. Correct interpretation of values and strong recommendations.	**6-7%** Covers MOST calculations, implication, and recommendations explicitly as required in the EVM analysis. No calculation errors. Some evidence to support going beyond the information provided and thought about the real-world implications. Clear, easy-to-read sentences developed, and short dot-point sentences are used in many situations. All sections are complete. Correct interpretation of values and strong recommendations.	**5%** Covers MANY calculations, implication, and recommendations explicitly as required in the EVM analysis. No calculation errors. Few evidence to support going beyond the information provided and few real-world implications. Many clear sentences, and short dot-point sentences. most sections are complete. Correct interpretation of values but offers weak recommendations	**3-4%** Covers SOME calculations, implication, and recommendations explicitly as required in the EVM analysis. Little evidence to support going beyond the information provided and thought about the real-world implications. Wrong interpretation of some values and weak recommendations	**0 - 2%** Covers LITTLE to NO calculations, implication, and recommendations explicitly as required in the EVM analysis. No evidence to support going beyond the information provided. Wrong interpretation of values and poor recommendations
	Clarity & Logic **2%**	**2%** The document was developed in a manner that is logical, readily understandable, and well written throughout. Implications and recommendations are presented skilfully and cohesively. Correct naming.	**2%** Mostly logical, readily understandable, and well written. Implications and recommendations are well presented. Correct naming.	**1%** Overall, logical, readily understandable, and well written. There may be some missing content. Structure is not consistent and clear.	**1%** Some logical, readily understandable, and well written statements. There is a lot of missing content. Structure is inconsistent, unclear, and hard to follow.	**0%** Poorly organized. Did not observe basic presentation or structuring techniques. A lot of missing content. Poor grammar and hard to read and follow.
	Content	**20 - 25%** Included ALL pertinent information on scope, methodology, standards,	**15 - 19%** Included MOST pertinent information on scope,	**10 - 14%** Included SOME pertinent information on scope,	**5 - 9%** Included LITTLE pertinent information on scope,	**0 - 4%** Included NO pertinent information on scope,

Quality Management Plan (30%)	25%	and testing. Follows the Define-Explain-Apply framework. Included most standards, laws, and regulations to be applied. Excellent explanation of the testing regime. Strong evidence to support going beyond the information provided and thought about the real-world implications when developing the content (throughout). Covers all the aspects explicitly provided in the template.	methodology, standards, and testing. Follows the Define-Explain-Apply framework. Included many standards, laws, and regulations to be applied. Good explanation of testing regime. Moderate evidence to support going beyond the information provided and thought about the real-world implications when developing the content. Covers most aspects explicitly provided in the template.	methodology, standards, and testing. Follows the Define-Explain-Apply framework. Included some standards, laws, and regulations to be applied. Fair explanation of the testing regime. Many aspects explicitly provided in the template. Some evidence to support going beyond the information provided and thought about the real-world implications when developing the content.	methodology, standards, and testing. Did not follow the Define-Explain-Apply framework. Unclear explanation of the testing regime. Included few standards, laws, and regulations to be applied. Little aspects explicitly provided in the template.	methodology, standards, and testing. Did not follow the Define-Explain-Apply framework. Unclear/No explanation of the testing regime. Did not cover the aspects explicitly provided in the template. Left template instructions in the final document.
	Clarity & Logic 5%	5% Document was developed in a manner that is logical, readily understandable, and well written throughout. Organisational pattern is clearly and consistently observable and is skilful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive. Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language is appropriate to audience. A variety of types of supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. Correct naming.	4% Mostly logical, readily understandable, and well written sections. Organisational pattern is clearly and consistently observable. Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. Supporting make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	3% Many logical, readily understandable, and well written sections. Organisational pattern is intermittently observable within the presentation. Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	2% Some logical, readily understandable, and well written sections. Organisational pattern is not observable within the presentation. Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation	0-1% Poorly organized. Did not observe time limit and delivery technique is poor.
Communication Plan (30%)	**Content** 25 %	20 – 25% Provides a COMPREHENSIVE framework for managing stakeholder communication.	15 - 19% Provides a SUFFICIENT framework for managing stakeholder communication.	10 - 14% Provides a USABLE framework for managing stakeholder communication.	5 - 9% Provides a UNCLEAR framework for managing stakeholder communication.	0 - 4% Provides a WEAK or NO framework for managing stakeholder

		Provides clear and strong explanation for all roles assigned to working groups. Included ALL working groups, meetings, and reports. Followed the cycle of "report>meeting/decision>report" Strong evidence to support meeting and reporting schedules recommended. Thought about real-world implications when developing the content. Covers all the aspects explicitly provided in the template.	Provides clear explanation for all roles assigned to working groups. Included ALL working groups, meetings, and reports. Followed the cycle of "report>meeting/decision>report". Splendid evidence to support meeting and reporting schedules recommended. Included most pertinent information in the solution. Covers most aspects explicitly provided in the template.	Provides limited explanation for the roles assigned to some working groups. Does not follow the cycle of "report>meeting/decision>report" in most cases. Included many pertinent information in the solution. Few evidence to support meeting and reporting schedules recommended. Covers many aspects explicitly provided in the template.	Provides no/unclear explanation for the roles assigned to some working groups. Does not follow the cycle of "report>meeting/decision>report" in most cases. Limited evidence to support meeting and reporting schedules recommended. Covers some aspects explicitly provided in the template. Included some pertinent information in the solution.	communication. Provides no explanation for the roles assigned to some working groups. Does not follow the cycle of "report>meeting/decision>report" in most cases. No evidence to support meeting and reporting schedules recommended. Does not cover many aspects provided in the template. Left template instructions in the final document.
	Clarity & Logic **5%**	**5%** The document was developed in a manner that is logical, readily understandable, and well written throughout. Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable and is skilful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive. ALL Clear, well-thought-out, easy-to-read, sentences or dot-point sentences included. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. A variety of types of supporting materials. Makes appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic (throughout). Correct naming.	**4%** Mostly developed in a manner that is logical, readily understandable, and well written. Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable. Mostly clear, well-thought-out, easy-to-read, sentences or dot-point sentences included. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. Some types of supporting materials. Refers to some information or analysis that supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. Correct naming.	**3%** Developed in a manner that is logical, readily understandable. Overall, logical, readily understandable, and well written. Organisational pattern is intermittently observable within the presentation.	**2%** Some logical, readily understandable, and well written statements. Organisational pattern is not observable within the presentation.	**0-1%** Poorly organized. Did not observe time limit and delivery technique is poor.
Risk Management Plan (25%)	**Content** **20%**	**17 - 20%** Identified at least 30 realistic moderate to very high risks. Identified risks from many risk dimensions as indicated in the RBS.	**13 - 16%** Identified at least 20 realistic moderate to very high risks. Identified risks from other risk dimensions as indicated in the	**9 - 12%** Identified at least 10 realistic moderate to very high risks. Identified risks from other risk dimensions as indicated in the	**5 - 8%** Identified at least 5 realistic moderate to very high risks. Identified risks from one or two risk dimensions provided	**0 - 4%** Provided less than 5 moderate to very high risks. Provides vague, unrealistic, broad risks. Identified risks

		Provides practical and suitable controls, contingency, and fallback strategies. Computed the EMV correctly and identified the best option. Provided strong additional analysis to the EMV calculation based on real-world factors. Included ALL pertinent information in the solution.	RBS. Provides practical and suitable controls, contingency, and fallback strategies. Computed the EMV correctly and identified the best option. Provided some additional analysis to the EMV calculation based on real-world factors. Included MOST pertinent information in the solution.	RBS. Provides few practical and suitable controls, contingency, and fallback strategies. Computed the EMV correctly and identified the best option. Provided insufficient additional analysis to the EMV calculation based on real-world factors. Included fairly reasonable pertinent information in the solution.	in the RBS. Provides very few practical and suitable controls, contingency, and fallback strategies. Some strategies recommended are wrong. Computed the EMV correctly and identified the best option. Provided very limited or unclear additional analysis to the EMV calculation based on real-world factors. Excluded pertinent information in the solution.	from only a single dimension. Ignored other dimensions provided in the RBS. Provides few to no practical and suitable controls, contingency, and fallback strategies. Recommended wrong strategies. Incorrect EMV calculations. Identified the wrong option. Provided no or unclear additional analysis to the EMV calculation. Excluded pertinent information in the solution.
	Clarity & Logic **5%**	**5%** Logical flow. Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. Correct naming.	**4%** Logical flow. Basic presentation. No compelling discussion. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. Generally easy to read and follow. Correct naming.	**3%** Logical flow. Language in presentation is somewhat appropriate to audience. Hard to read and follow. Correct naming.	**2%** Some issues with the overall presentation, analysis, and recommendations. Hard to read and follow. Incorrect naming.	**0-1%** Poorly organized. Did not observe time limit and delivery technique is poor. Hard to read and follow. Incorrect naming.

Additional comments/and feedback (if any):