

Assessment 4 Rubric

PPMP20007 Project Management Concepts (Term 1 2025)

Criteria	HD (High Distinction)	D (Distinction)	C (Credit)	P (Pass)	Unsatisfactory
Executive Summary (3 Marks)	3 Marks: - Exceptionally clear, concise, and visually appealing. - Highlights all key details: project objectives, goals, deliverables, and scope in a very engaging format.	2.5 Marks: - Clear and concise, with good presentation. - All key details are present but could be presented more effectively or concisely.	2 Marks: - Includes most key details but lacks clarity or effectiveness in presentation. - Missing some visual appeal or organization.	1.5 Marks: - Executive summary is vague or unclear. - Lacks key details and visual elements.	0-1 Mark: No summary provided or very poorly executed.
Project Objectives and Scope (7 Marks)	7 Marks: - Clear justification of why the project qualifies as a project using all six characteristics. - Scope statement is detailed and precise, with SMART goals and well-defined deliverables and boundaries. - Comprehensive prioritisation using Project Iron Triangle or Project Priority Matrix.	6 Marks: - Mostly clear justification with minor gaps. - Scope statement is clear, but goals may lack some detail. - Prioritisation identified but could be better supported.	5 Marks: - Justification and scope statement are present but not fully clear or comprehensive. - Goals are not fully SMART, and deliverables are vague. - Prioritisation is weak or unclear.	4 Marks: - Missing key project characteristics or justification. - Scope and goals unclear or incomplete. - Prioritisation is weak or missing.	0-3 Marks: No submission or significant gaps in the scope and objectives.
Project Scheduling and Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) (10 Marks)	10 Marks: - WBS is comprehensive with at least five levels and four major deliverables, each having at least three work packages. - Gantt chart is detailed, with task dependencies, milestones, and a clear timeline. - Project Network & CPM analysis is accurate and detailed.	8-9 Marks: - WBS mostly complete with minor gaps. - Gantt chart provided but lacks full details like dependencies or milestones. - Project Network & CPM has minor issues or lacks full clarity.	6-7 Marks: - WBS is incomplete or lacks sufficient detail. - Gantt chart is present but unclear or lacks critical details. - Project Network & CPM analysis is incomplete or inaccurate.	4-5 Marks: - WBS is missing or too vague. - Gantt chart poorly structured or missing. - Project Network & CPM missing or incorrect.	0-3 Marks: No submission or entirely incorrect.
Budgeting and Cost Management (5 Marks)	5 Marks: - Detailed budget with accurate cost estimates and contingency reserves. - Well-justified budget	4 Marks: - Budget is mostly complete with minor omissions. - Justification is present but not	3 Marks: - Budget is incomplete or lacks detail. - Justification weak or unclear.	2 Marks: - Budget and cash flow are missing key elements or are poorly presented.	0-1 Mark: No submission or major errors in budgeting and cost.

	allocations, supported by relevant techniques. - Cash flow chart is well-constructed and accurate.	fully clear or detailed. - Cash flow chart is mostly accurate, but some timings are unclear.	- Cash flow chart is incomplete or not entirely accurate.		
Quality Management Plan (3 Marks)	3 Marks: - Quality objectives are clear, measurable, and well-supported. - Processes for quality assurance and control are detailed and align with project success.	2.5 Marks: - Quality objectives are clear but may lack some measurability. - Processes are present but lack full detail or clarity.	2 Marks: - Quality objectives are unclear or not measurable. - Processes for quality assurance and control are vague.	1.5 Marks: - No clear quality objectives or poorly defined processes.	0-1 Mark: No submission or very poor quality management plan.
Risk Management Plan (7 Marks)	7 Marks: - At least 12 risks identified with clear categorization. - Risk responses are appropriate and well-documented. - Severity matrix is comprehensive and clearly presented.	5-6 Marks: - Risks identified but some categories or responses lack detail. - Severity matrix is present but not fully developed or lacks clarity.	4 Marks: - Missing key risks, or responses are vague. - Severity matrix is incomplete or unclear.	2-3 Marks: - Major risks missing or poorly defined. - No clear response strategies.	0-1 Mark: No submission or completely incorrect.
Stakeholder Management & Communication Plan (5 Marks)	5 Marks: - All key stakeholders identified, with clear roles and responsibilities. - Responsibility Matrix and Power/Interest Matrix are clearly defined. - Communication plan is detailed and includes all stakeholders and channels.	4 Marks: - Most stakeholders are identified, but roles could be clearer. - Responsibility and Power/Interest matrices are present but could be more detailed.	3 Marks: - Stakeholders identified but roles are unclear. - Matrix and communication plan missing or unclear.	2 Marks: - Stakeholder analysis incomplete or unclear. - Responsibility and Power/Interest matrices missing or poorly defined.	0-1 Mark: No submission or major gaps in stakeholder analysis and communication.
Part B: Supporting Artefacts and Research Repository (5 Marks)	5 Marks: - All required materials in the OneDrive folder, clear and accessible link provided.	4 Marks: - Most required materials are included, but the folder is not well organised. - Link provided but not easily accessible.	3 Marks: - Missing some materials or poorly organised folder.	2 Marks: - Very few materials in the folder, poorly organized.	0-1 Mark: No OneDrive link or materials provided.
Part C: Reflection (5 Marks)	5 Marks: - Detailed, thoughtful reflection with specific examples of GenAI usage.	4 Marks: - Reflection includes some examples but lacks depth or insight.	3 Marks: - Reflection present but lacks depth or detail.	2 Marks: - Reflection lacks specific examples or significant insight.	0-1 Mark: No reflection submitted.
Penalty (Peer Evaluation if applicable)					