

Rubric

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>OUTSTANDING A* Marks in the range 80%-100%</i>	<i>EXCELLENT A Marks in the range 70%-79%</i>	<i>COMPETENT B Marks in the range 60%-69%</i>	<i>SATISFACTORY C Marks in the range 50%-59%</i>	<i>ADEQUATE D Marks in the range 40%-49%</i>	<i>MARGINAL FAIL E+ Marks in the range 35%-39%</i>	<i>NON MARGINAL FAIL E- Marks in the range 30%-34%</i>	<i>Fail F Marks below 30%</i>
<p>1) Context and Framing.</p> <p><i>Have you identified a problem or a domain of application for your system? Have you described in detail the context in which your application is relevant?</i></p>	Displays an exceptional degree of originality and creativity. Solution has remarkable novel aspects. Authoritative coverage of topic showing insight and critical thought.	Demonstrates ability to analyse, interpret and organise information to produce coherent accounts or solve complex problems. Interesting and novel/creative aspects of the solution are evident.	Evidence of thorough understanding of material. Some originality of thought or approach. Acknowledge of an emerging theme and extend the theme with new information or insight.	Displays ability to analyse, interpret and organise information. Good understanding of material but tends to be descriptive in approach.	Demonstrates an ability to address limited, well-defined, problems of a familiar type.	Work displays deficiencies and omissions too serious to warrant a pass	Displays serious deficiencies and omissions. Fragmentary understanding of the problem.	Work shows little effort, contains serious deficiencies and shows little adherence to the task.
<p>2) Motivation and Significance</p> <p><i>Have included links to other systems or to research justifying the need for your system, by adequately positioning your work within this background? Or, have you explained why your potential system will be an improvement on other systems?</i></p>	There are a number of peer-reviewed references (scientific papers or authoritative books) to support the claim, which provide a balanced and complete view of the topic, and which are analysed and discussed with competence. Responses show evidence of outside research.	There are a number of peer-reviewed references (scientific papers or authoritative books) to support the claim, which are discussed. Responses show evidence of outside research.	There are a number of quality references, not necessarily academic, to support the claim. Responses show evidence of outside research.	Most claims show evidence of outside reading and research.	Limited evidence of outside reading. Limited discussion on the relevance of such readings.	Little to no evidence of outside reading. References may be present, but they are not discussed.	Work not supported by outside research, but based only on required reading/slides.	No backing or support for the claims.

<p>3) Data analysis</p> <p><i>Think of three or four possible categories of users of your system, and for each focus on one or two functionalities that will be carried out by your system and you understand well. Have you listed which information is going to be used/exchanged in these processes? Have you listed the main notions (entities) that support these functionalities, and explained what they represent, in plain text? Have you listed for each entity, the main features you need to include in the database (possibly pointing back to the functionalities you are supporting)? Have you included a glossary of the terms that must be included in the final database?</i></p>	<p>Displays an exceptional degree of analytical and problem solving skills. Solution has remarkable novel aspects and demonstrates an excellent understanding of the assignment. Contains substantial elements of originality and independent thinking coupled with insightful critical analysis of the topics. Addresses all parts of the assignment</p>	<p>Displays in-depth understanding of material. Comprehensive coverage of topic. Contains critical analysis of the facts in hand. Demonstrates ability to analyse, interpret and organise information. Provides enlightening insights to the assignment. Addresses all parts of the assignment</p>	<p>Provides factually sound evidence of thorough understanding of assignment tasks and detailed description of all required elements. Some originality of thought or approach. Addresses all parts of the assignment</p>	<p>Provides good evidence of understanding of assignment tasks and detailed description of all aspects. Some originality of thought or approach, but some important points could be further explored. Addresses all parts of the assignment</p>	<p>General knowledge and understanding of the task but limited in depth or breadth. Demonstrates an ability to solve limited, well-defined, problems of a familiar type.</p>	<p>Knowledge and understanding of the subject are fragmentary, some aspects showing a very basic level of understanding but other aspects displaying fundamental errors and omissions</p>	<p>Knowledge and understanding of the subject are fragmentary, with an insufficient number of aspects showing a very basic level of understanding and too many aspects displaying fundamental errors and omissions</p>	<p>Very limited range of knowledge with many important gaps and omissions. Shows incomplete understanding with numerous errors of interpretation.</p>
<p>4) Coherence and Structure</p> <p><i>Are the various parts of your report integrated into a coherent whole? Is the text well structured, logically? Is the language appropriate and the style polished? Is the text free from grammar and spelling mistakes?</i></p>	<p>Engaging and compelling read. Parts are integrated into a coherent whole; the text is well-structured. No grammatical or spelling errors.</p>	<p>Competently written. Parts are integrated into a coherent whole; the text is well-structured. Virtually no grammatical or spelling errors.</p>	<p>Well written and easy to read. The text is well-structured. Style is appropriate. Minor grammatical or spelling errors.</p>	<p>Clear, well structured account, but lacking in breadth or depth of the discussion, schematically presented points. Some grammatical or spelling errors.</p>	<p>Structure is patchy, and there are grammatical or spelling errors, but this does not detract from the clarity of the submission.</p>	<p>Contains a number of grammatical or typographical errors. Structure is confusing and language sometimes inappropriate.</p>	<p>Contains major grammatical or typographical errors. Poorly structured and difficult to follow.</p>	<p>Contains significant grammatical or typographical errors. Poorly structured, difficult to follow. Poorly written.</p>