Assassman	at tuno	Course outcome percentage							
Assessme	CO1	CO2	CO3	Total (%)					
Propo	sal	5	5	0	10				
Drogross	Progress 1	0	2	0					
Progress	Progress 2	0	3	0	3				
Droinet	Prototype	7	8	0	15				
Project	Presentation	0	0	10	10				
			Grand t	otal (%)	40				

#### **Proposal evaluation**

Туре	co	COMPETENCY	Weight	Full marks
Croun	CO1	The idea / principle of the solution		
Group	COI	-explanation should describe the proposed idea in general	0.5	5
		Review of TWO EXISTINGS SYSTEM that have similarity with your		
Group	CO1	idea.		
Group	COI	- explanation should analyse and highlight on		
		features/strength/ weakness/advantage/disadvantage	0.5	5
		PROJECT MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK		
Group	CO1	- explanation should be on Agile-based project management		
		framework, Gantt chart	1.5	15
		PROJECT REQUIREMENT		
Group	CO1	- should describe the non-functional requirements related to		
		the project.	1	10
		PROPOSED DESIGN		
Group	CO2	- should describe the proposed design related to project		
		requirement.	2	20
1 - 45 - 54 1	000	DATA DESIGN		
Individual	CO2	- should provide the ERD (up to 3NF), data dictionary and	1.5	15
		PROPOSED DESIGN		
Individual	CO2	- should describe the visual design according to the module		
		(presentation model/prototype interface)	1.5	15
Croup	CO1	TESTING PLAN		
Group	COI	- should describe the relevant testing strategy/approach	0.5	5
Group	CO1	DEPLOYMENT PLAN		
Group	001	- should describe the relevant deployment strategy, platform	0.5	5
Group	CO1	Al Turnitin report with similarity result not more than 30%.	0.5	5
			10	100

### Progress 1 evaluation

	CO1: Des	ign appropriate solution using fun	damental web engineering	g concepts.						i
	CO2: Con	struct a web-based application pro	totype using HTML, web se	erver, database and scripti	ng language based on web	engineering methodology	/-			T
	CO3: Den	nonstrate communication effective	ly in written and oral form	through group discussion,	meeting and presentation	session.				T
										Ī
					PROGRESS 1					į
TYPE	со		Failed	Very Weak	Weak	Moderate	Good	Excellent	WEIGHT	FULL MARK
ITPE	CO	OUTCOMES	0	1	2	3	4	5	2%	20
GROUP	CO2	Setup development environment/repository	No development setup	20% of repository is setup	in between	50% of repository is setup	in between	Development environment is setup	0.2	2
GROUP	CO2	Create project database and	Database not created	1 table created	All tables from 1 module are connected	All tables from 2 modules are connected	All tables from 3 modules are connected	All tables are connected	0.2	2
GROUP	CO2	tables in RDBMS	No PK/FK created		More 30% PK and FK are correct	More 50% PK and FK are correct	More 70% PK and FK are correct	More 90% PK and FK are correct	0.3	3
GROUP	CO2	Create web page design / layout structure	No design created	Layout applied with mininum design (e.g.: colour only)	in between	Layout applied for 2 modules, slightly easy to use and navigate	in between	Layout are consistant for all modules, easy to use and navigate	0.3	3
GROUP	CO2	Create login and logout page for all users	Login/logout not created	Login created without logout	in between	Correct login/logout implementation and session not kill	in between	Correct login/logout implementation and session kill	0.5	5
GROUP	CO2		Login/logout not created	Illogin/logout created for	Login/logout created for two users without password encryption	Login/logout created for 2 users with password encryption	Login/logout created for all users without password encryption	Login/logout created for all users with password encryption	0.5	5
					i				2	20

#### Progress 2 evaluation

					l L					
					PROGRESS 2					i
TYPE	co	OUTCOMES	Failed	Very Weak	Weak	Moderate	Good	Excellent	WEIGHT	FULL MARKS
	-	OUTCOMES	0	1	2	3	4	5	3%	30
INDIVIDUAL	CO2		No insert function	Some values insert without PK generated	Some related values inserted to database table without PK	linserted to database	Some values insert with PK generated	All related values insert to database table with correct PK generated	0.5	5
INDIVIDUAL	CO2	Data manipulation / Basic CRUD	No delete function	Delete all rows and columns in a table	in between	Some related values deleted from the database table according to the identified key	in between	All related values deleted according to the identified key	0.5	5
INDIVIDUAL	CO2	Data manipulation / basic ckob	No update function	Update all rows and columns in a table	in between	Some related values updated from the database table according to the identified key	in between	All related values updated correctly according to the identified key	0.5	5
INDIVIDUAL	CO2		No view page	View page displayed unrelated data	in between	Only some values in a view page displayed	in between	Related values for a view page displayed correctly	0.5	5
INDIVIDUAL	CO2	Database	Database not according to the Progress 1	are maintained	More than 30% of tables are maintained according to the Progress	maintained according to	More than 70% of tables are maintained according to the Progress	More than 90% of tables are maintained according to the Progress	1	10
					i	-			3	30
					l					1

### **Project evaluation**

				F	ULL PROTOTYPE					
TYPE	co	OUTCOMES	Failed	Very Weak	Weak	Moderate	Good	Excellent	WEIGHT	ULL MARK
1166	CO	OUTCOMES	0	1	2	3	4	5	15%	60
INDIVIDUAL	CO1	Consistent web page design / layout stucture	No design created	Layout applied with mininum design (e.g.: colour only)	Layout applied but not consistent for all modules	Layout applied for 2 modules, slightly easy to use and navigate	Layout applied for 3 modules, slightly easy to use and navigate	Layout are consistent for all modules, easy to use and navigate	0.5	2
INDIVIDUAL	CO1	Apply login and logout page for all users	Login/logout not created	Login created without logout	in between	Correct login/logout implementation and session not kill	in between	Correct login/logout implementation and session kill	1	4
INDIVIDUAL	CO1	Use of HTML elements	No form provided	All input fields are using	in between	Many input fields using	in between	More than 90% suitable	1	4
INDIVIDUAL	CO1	Use of CSS framework (Bootstrap, Tailwind etc)	No framework used	1 page of UI using CSS framework	in between	Some UI using CSS framework	in between	More 80% UI using CSS framework	1	4
INDIVIDUAL	CO2	Implementation of JavaScript methods	No JavaScript methods	Method codes are provided but not working	in between	Only 1 method implemented	in between	More than 2 methods implemented	1	4
INDIVIDUAL	CO2	Complete prototype requirements	Not follow the requirements	20% of the prototype are complete according to the requirements	30% of the prototype are complete according to the requirements	50% of the prototype are complete according to the requirements	More 70% of the prototype are complete according to the requirements	prototype are complete according to the requirements	1	4
INDIVIDUAL	CO2	QR code	No QR generator implementated	QR code generator given but not working	in between	Correct implementation of QR code generator but NOT able to save into the database table	in between	Correct implementation of QR code generator and save into the database table	0.5	2
INDIVIDUAL	CO2		No page provided once QR code scanned	No page developed, show only key information once QR code is scanned	in between	Develop a page but with inappropriate content once QR code is scanned	in between	Develop a page with appropriate content once QR code is scanned	0.5	2

# Project evaluation (continue)

INDIVIDUAL	CO2		No single data displayed:	Codes are provided but not working	Only one data representation from single database table but less appropriate and less meaningful form	More than one data representation from single database table but less appropriate and meaningful form	Only one data representation from single database table in appropriate and meaningful form	More than one data representation from single database table in appropriate and meaningful form	0.5	2
INDIVIDUAL	CO2		No join table data displayed	Codes are provided but not working	Only one data representation from multiple database tables but less appropriate and less	More than one data representation from multiple database tables but less appropriate and less	Only one data representation from single database table in appropriate and meaningful form	More than one data representation from multiple database tables in appropriate and meaningful form	2	8
INDIVIDUAL	CO2	Dashboard		Codes are provided but not working	Only one data representation using SQL COUNT() / SUM() but less appropriate and less meaningful form	More than one data representation using SQL COUNT() / SUM() but less appropriate and less meaningful form	Only one data representation using SQL COUNT() / SUM() in appropriate and meaningful form	More than one data representation using SQL COUNT() / SUM() in appropriate and meaningful form	0.5	2
INDIVIDUAL	CO2		representation of data	Codes are provided but not working	One graphical representation data but less appropriate and meaningful form	More than one graphical representation data but less appropriate and meaningful form	One graphical representation data in appropriate and meaningful form	More than one graphical representation data in appropriate and meaningful form	1	4
INDIVIDUAL	CO2			Codes are provided but not working	Provide one search function in less appropriate and less meaningful form	Provide one search function in appropriate and meaningful form	Provide more than one search function in appropriate and meaningful form	Provide more than two search function in appropriate and meaningful form	1	4
INDIVIDUAL	CO1	Module integration	No integration with other module	2 modules intergrated	3 modules are completely integrated but with minor error	3 modules are completely integrated and works without error	All modules are completely integrated but with minor error	All modules are completely integrated and works without error	1	4
INDIVIDUAL	CO1	Apply repository for deployment	No repository apply for deployment	Apply a repository but not utilize	Apply a repository to commit/deploy 1 module	Apply a repository to commit/deploy more than half modules	Apply a repository to commit 3 modules and apply deployment	Apply a repository to commit all modules and apply deployment	1	4
INDIVIDUAL	CO1	Prototype system flow	Illogical system flow	20% of the system flow are logic and acceptable	30% of the system flow are logic and acceptable	50% of the system flow are logic and acceptable	More 70% of the system flow are logic and acceptable	More than 90% of the system flow are logic and acceptable	1.5	6
									13	OU

#### Presentation

						PRESENTATION	l				
		co		Failed	Very Weak	Weak	Moderate	Good	Excellent	WEIGHT	FULL MARKS
	L		OUTCOMES	0	1	2	3	4	5	5%	20
0	RΔI		Oral Presentation: Capability to elloborate	No presentation	Student does not have the understanding to to eloborate their module.	Student explains on the basic information of the module only	Student is not comfortable with understanding to eloborate module and only can explain about the basic information in the module	understanding about the module design information, but not able	Student has full understanding about their module and able to eloborate in detail module solution	2	8
	ORAL	CO3	QnA	No Q&A	Cannot answer the question	Cannot response to the question confidently	Response to question with several attempts and some false statement.	Able to response to question with confident and some minor false statement.	Able to response to question confidently and correctly.	2	8
			Student attire and appearance	Student absent from presentation	Student does not follow the university attire	in between	The student is dressed 50% professionally according to the university attire guideline	in between	The student is dressed professionally according to the university attire guideline	1	4
					!			!		5	20
					1				i i		

OUTCOMES	Failed 0	Very Weak 1	Weak 2	Moderate	Good	Excellent	WEIGHT	FULL MARKS
OUTCOMES	0	1	2	_				
				3	4	5	5%	20
	No report submission	Provide more than 10% of	Provide more than 30% of	Provide more than 50% of	Provide more than 70% of	Provide complete content	2	8
Technical report content		the implementation	the implementation	the implementation	the implementation	on implementation		
	No report submission	Designs are according to	in between	50% updated design from	in between	Provide updated design	1	4
		the proposal		the proposal		from the proposal		
TEAM MANAGEMENT				Provide meeting		Provide meeting		
- Minutes / report of meeting or	No report provided	Provide meeting	in between	summary with unclear	in between	summary with clear	1	4
discussion.		summary only		description		description		
Peer assessment	No neer accessment	Peer assessment more	in between	Peer assessment more	in hetween	Peer assessment more	1	4
reei assessillelli	No peer assessment	than 10%	III between	than 50%	III between	than 90%	1	-
							5	20
	TEAM MANAGEMENT - Minutes / report of meeting or	Technical report content  No report submission  TEAM MANAGEMENT - Minutes / report of meeting or discussion.  No report provided	Technical report content  No report submission  TEAM MANAGEMENT - Minutes / report of meeting or discussion.  No report provided Provide meeting summary only  Peer assessment  No peer assessment  No peer assessment  Peer assessment	Technical report content  No report submission  TEAM MANAGEMENT - Minutes / report of meeting or discussion.  No report provided Provide meeting in between summary only  Peer assessment  No peer assessment  In hetween	Technical report content  No report submission  TEAM MANAGEMENT - Minutes / report of meeting or discussion.  Peer assessment  No peer assessment  Technical report content  The implementation the implementation the implementation some provided in between the proposal provide meeting in between summary with unclear description  Peer assessment  Technical report content  No report submission  Team Management  No report provided Provide meeting in between description  Peer assessment  Peer assessment more  The implementation the implementation some in between some provided in between in between provided description  Team Management  Provide meeting in between description  Peer assessment more	Technical report content  No report submission  TEAM MANAGEMENT - Minutes / report of meeting or discussion.  No report submission  No report provided meeting or discussion.  Peer assessment  No peer assessment  No peer assessment  No peer assessment  The implementation is implementation the implementation to possible in between the proposal in between the	Technical report content  No report submission  TEAM MANAGEMENT - Minutes / report of meeting or discussion.  Provide meeting summary only  Peer assessment  No peer assessment  Technical report content  The implementation the implementation on implementation on implementation the implementation the implementation the implementation on implementation on implementation for in between in between the proposal from the proposal	Technical report content  No report submission  TEAM MANAGEMENT - Minutes / report of meeting or discussion.  No report submission  Team management of the implementation in between in bet