Team Member Names:

|  |
| --- |
| Pitch Marking |
| Team Skills: 4.1 Students will be able to work both independently and collaboratively using team processes to achieve agreed outcomes. Critical Thinking Skills: 2.1 Students will be able to think critically about issues and problems, and draw defensible conclusions.Communication Skills: 3.1 Students will be able to write in ways appropriate to the discipline, audience, purpose and context. |
| Standards Criteria | Below Expectations (Fail) 0-49 | Meet Expectations (Pass) 50-59 | Meets Expectations (Credit) 60-69 | Exceeds Expectations (Distinction) 70-79 | Exceeds Expectations (High Distinction)80-100 | Comments |
| Problem/Issue | The problem is not | The problem is stated | The problem is stated | The problem is stated | The problem is stated |  |
| Hot Topic | clearly stated anddescribed. | clearly and described withenough information for an | clearly and describedwith detailed | clearly and describedthoroughly for a more | clearly, describedcomprehensively, and is |
|  |  | adequate understanding. | information. | comprehensive | succinctly delivered with |
|  |  |  |  | understanding. | relevant information |
|  |  |  |  |  | necessary for full |
|  |  |  |  |  | understanding. |
| Define, Refine and Articulate | The analysis is superficial, and based on irrelevant information, concepts and methods. | A coherent analysis is based on partial use of relevant information, concepts and methods. | A coherent analysis is based on relevant information, concepts and methods. | A coherent analysis is based on thorough use of relevant information, concepts and methods. | A comprehensive analysis from a deep understanding of relevant information, concepts and methods. |  |
| Stakeholders | Shows limited evidence that stakeholders were consulted. | Shows adequate evidence that stakeholders were consulted. | Shows evidence that multiple stakeholders were consulted. | Shows detailed evidence that multiple stakeholders were consulted. | Shows detailed evidence that multiple stakeholders were consulted extensively. |
|  | Shows limited evidence of empathy or objectivity. | Shows adequate evidence of empathy or objectivity. | Shows evidence of empathy and objectivity towards stakeholders. | Shows well-reasoned empathy and objectivity towards stakeholders. | Shows extensive and well- reasoned empathy and objectivity towards stakeholders. |
| Alternative | Shows limited evidence | Shows adequate evidence | Shows detailed evidence | Shows evidence of | Shows comprehensive |  |
| Contexts | of how this hot topic wassolved in other contexts. | of solutions to this hottopic in other contexts. | of solutions to this hottopic in other contexts. | solutions to this hottopic in other contexts | evidence of solutions tothis hot topic in other |
|  |  |  |  | in thorough detail. | contexts, using detail and |
|  |  |  |  |  | analytical language. |

|  |
| --- |
| Pitch Marking |
| Team Skills: 4.1 Students will be able to work both independently and collaboratively using team processes to achieve agreed outcomes. Critical Thinking Skills: 2.1 Students will be able to think critically about issues and problems, and draw defensible conclusions.Communication Skills: 3.1 Students will be able to write in ways appropriate to the discipline, audience, purpose and context. |
| Standards Criteria | Below Expectations (Fail) 0-49 | Meets Expectations (Pass) 50-59 | Meets Expectations (Credit) 60-69 | Exceeds Expectations (Distinction) 70-79 | Exceeds Expectations (High Distinction)80-100 | Comments |
| Solutions | Shows limited evidence of the iteration process and | Shows adequate evidence of the iteration process | Shows evidence of the iteration process, and | Shows evidence of a productive iteration | Shows evidence of a highly collaborative and |  |
|  | alternative solutions. | and limited alternative | provides several | process, and provides | productive iteration |
|  |  | solutions. | alternative solutions. | several achievable | process, and provides a |
|  |  |  |  | solutions. | number of achievable and |
|  |  |  |  |  | innovative solutions. |
| Final Outcome | Provides a limited explanation of why their final outcome was the best solution.Provides no success indicators.Provides limited information about the positive and negative impacts of their project, and limited opportunities for improvement. | Gives a limited explanation of their final solution.Provides success indicators, but they may not achievable.Provides adequate information about the positive and negative impacts of their project, and opportunities for improvement. | Provides evidence as to why their final outcome was their best solution.Provides logical success indicators for short and long term measurability.Provides detailed information about the positive and negative impacts of their project, and reflective opportunities for improvement. | Provides detailed evidence as to why their final outcome was their most logical solution.Provides achievable and logical success indicators for short and long term measurability.Provides insightful information about the positive and negative impacts of their project, and thoughtful and reflective opportunities for improvement. | Provides compelling evidence as to why their final outcome was their most logical and achievable solution.Provides detailed reasons for logical success indicators, and outlines how they will use these to measure impact over the long and short term.Provides comprehensive and insightful positives and negatives of the project impacts, and comprehensive and thoughtful opportunities for improvement. |  |
| Recommendation | Makes no | Makes a limited or | Makes a reasonable and | Makes an achievable | Makes a comprehensive, |  |
|  | recommendation forfurther action. | inconsequentialrecommendation for | achievablerecommendation for | and logicalrecommendation for | achievable and logicalrecommendation for |
|  |  | further action. | further action. | further action using | further action using detail. |
|  |  |  |  | detail. |  |