

INOVM0028 The Role of AI in Digital Innovation

Team Project - 60% | Team Assessment marking matrix | 2026-27

Component	Criterion	Weight %	Evidence judged	Unit ILOs	High Distinction 80-100	Distinction 70-79	Merit 60-69	Pass 50-59	Marginal Pass 40-49	Fail 0-39	Zero 0
Evidence Deck	AI-informed project development and outcomes	20	Evidence of AI exploration, selection, application, project development and a clear outcome.	ILO 1, ILO 2	Exceptional synthesis of AI knowledge and project evidence. The outcome is authoritative, purposeful and highly developed; choices are convincingly justified through testing and insight.	Excellent synthesis and application of AI knowledge. The outcome is clear, convincing and well developed, with strong evidence and justification.	Good application of AI knowledge to a coherent outcome. Evidence and reasoning are sound, though depth, synthesis or development may be uneven.	Satisfactory application producing an understandable outcome. Relevant evidence is present, but development or justification is limited and may be descriptive.	Partial evidence of AI-informed development. The outcome or reasoning is underdeveloped, inconsistent or weakly connected to evidence.	Insufficient evidence of purposeful AI-informed development. Major gaps affect the outcome, process or justification.	No relevant evidence submitted or demonstrated.
Evidence Deck	Critical evaluation of AI use, limitations and impact	10	Evaluation of effectiveness, limitations, risks, trade-offs, feasibility and potential impact.	ILO 1, ILO 2	Exceptional critical evaluation integrating technical, ethical and contextual implications. Limits and trade-offs are handled with sophisticated judgement.	Excellent critical evaluation of effectiveness, limitations and impact, supported by convincing evidence and strong judgement.	Good evaluation with relevant consideration of limits, risks and impact. Some implications or trade-offs require deeper synthesis.	Satisfactory evaluation identifying relevant strengths and limits, but analysis is basic, uneven or weakly evidenced.	Partial evaluation with limited analysis of consequences, risks or feasibility.	Insufficient critical evaluation; claims are unsupported or significant implications are overlooked.	No relevant evidence submitted or demonstrated.
Evidence Deck	Collaborative development of responsible AI-informed practice	10	Shared responsibility, experimentation, decision-making, communication and responsible practice.	ILO 2, ILO 4	Exceptional shared ownership and responsible practice. Collaboration, experimentation and professional judgement are deeply integrated and clearly evidenced.	Excellent collaborative development with clear shared responsibility, strong communication and well-evidenced responsible practice.	Good collaboration and shared development. Roles and decisions are evident, with sound responsible practice despite some unevenness.	Satisfactory team working with basic evidence of shared responsibility and responsible practice; integration is limited.	Partial or uneven collaboration. Ownership, communication or responsible practice is weakly evidenced.	Insufficient evidence of genuine collaboration or responsible AI-informed practice.	No relevant evidence submitted or demonstrated.
Team Learning Conversation	AI-informed project development and outcomes	10	Recorded explanation connecting the development path and outcome to Evidence Deck evidence.	ILO 1, ILO 2	The team explains and defends the development path with exceptional command, connecting evidence, AI capability and the outcome through sophisticated reasoning.	The team gives an excellent, convincing explanation of how evidence and AI understanding shaped the outcome.	The team gives a good and coherent explanation, with sound links between evidence, choices and outcome.	The team gives a satisfactory account of development and outcome, but explanation or justification lacks depth.	The team provides a partial or inconsistent explanation with weak links to evidence.	The team cannot adequately explain the development path, evidence or outcome.	No relevant oral evidence demonstrated.
Team Learning Conversation	Critical evaluation of AI use, limitations and impact	5	Recorded critical discussion, justification and response to questions about limits, risks and impact.	ILO 1, ILO 2	The team responds with exceptional critical agility, evaluating limits, consequences and trade-offs with sophisticated, evidence-led judgement.	The team critically discusses and justifies AI decisions with excellent clarity, evidence and responsiveness.	The team evaluates key decisions and limits well, though some answers lack depth or synthesis.	The team identifies relevant strengths and limits but responses are mainly descriptive or only partly justified.	The team shows partial critical understanding; responses are hesitant, inconsistent or weakly evidenced.	The team provides insufficient evaluation or cannot justify material AI-related decisions.	No relevant oral evidence demonstrated.
Team Learning Conversation	Collaborative development of responsible AI-informed practice	5	Recorded evidence of shared ownership, role clarity, communication and collective understanding.	ILO 2, ILO 4	The conversation demonstrates exceptional collective ownership: contributions are integrated, roles are understood and the team reasons responsibly as a coherent whole.	The team demonstrates excellent shared ownership, clear role understanding and strong collective communication.	The team demonstrates good shared understanding and role clarity, with minor unevenness in participation or integration.	The team demonstrates satisfactory shared understanding, though ownership or role clarity is basic or uneven.	Shared ownership is only partly demonstrated; participation or collective understanding is inconsistent.	Insufficient evidence of shared ownership, role understanding or responsible collective practice.	No relevant oral evidence demonstrated.

Marking bands: High Distinction 80-100; Distinction 70-79; Merit 60-69; Pass 50-59; Marginal Pass 40-49; Fail 0-39; Zero 0.