COSC2803 2023 Semester 1 | Rubric | Milestones 2-4

Milestones 2-3	Weight	Elements	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Poor (1.5)	NN (0)
UX & UI Implementation	**5 marks**	(1) UX/UI Implementation satisfies relevant Personas; (2) UX/UI Implementation satisfies relevant Context Scenarios tied to the relevant Personas; (3) UX/UI Implementation satisfies Nielsen design heuristics and/or makes appropriate trade-offs; (4) UX/UI Implementation employs appropriate UI Design Patterns in (but not limited to) Navigation, Page Layout and Interaction patterns; (5) UX/UI element has been redesigned based on Usability testing feedback.	The implementation of the UX/UI enables the requirements of **Level 1, 2 and 3**, plus one **Level 4** extension task to an **outstanding** quality.	The implementation of the UX/UI enables the requirements of **Levels 1, 2 and 3**, to a **satisfactory** quality.	The implementation of the UX/UI enables the requirements of **Levels 1 and 2**, to a **satisfactory** quality.	The implementation of the UX/UI enables the requirements of **Level 1**, to a **satisfactory** quality.	Insufficient for Poor category.
			The UX/UI clearly enables **all relevant** Personas to accomplish **all relevant** Context Scenarios. All Personas and Context Scenarios are **highly relevant** to the social challenge.	The UX/UI enables **all relevant** Personas to accomplish **all relevant** Context Scenarios. All Personas and Context Scenarios are **relevant** to the social challenge.	The UX/UI enables **some relevant** Personas to accomplish **some relevant** Context Scenarios, with issues or inconsistencies. **Most** Personas and Context Scenarios are relevant to the social challenge.	The UX/UI enables **at least one** relevant Personas to accomplish at least one relevant Context Scenarios, with **significant issues or inconsistencies**.	
			UX/UI implementation **satisfies** Nielsen design principles. Any trade-offs of design principles are **fully justified**.	UX/UI implementation **satisfies** Nielsen design principles. Any trade-offs of design principles are **sufficiently justified**.	UX/UI implementation satisfies Nielsen design principles, with **issues or inconsistencies**. Any trade-offs of design principles **may not** be justified.	UX/UI implementation satisfies some Nielsen design principles, but has **significant issues**. Any trade-offs of design principles **may not** be justified.	
			UX/UI implementation **outstandingly** and **consistently** applies **multiple relevant** UX/UI Design patterns across the **entire** website.	UX/UI implementation **satisfactorily** and **consistently** applies relevant UX/UI Design patterns across the **entire** website.	UX/UI implementation **satisfactorily** applies UX/UI Design patterns with **inconsistencies** across the entire website.	UX/UI implementation **does not** apply suitable UX/UI Design patterns.	
			At least one significant element of the UX/UI has been redesigned and reimplemented based on feedback from the usability testing. The redesign provides a **clear improvement**.	At least one significant element of the UX/UI has been redesigned and reimplemented based on feedback from the usability testing. The redesign provides a **satisfactory improvement**.	At least one element of the UX/UI has been redesigned and reimplemented based on feedback from the usability testing. The redesign **may not** provide an improvement.	The UX/UI has been **may not** have been changed based on feedback from the usability testing.	
Database Modelling	**5 marks**	(1) ER Models of the *implemented* and *proposed* databases are presented in the form of an ER Diagram and follows UML notation used in class, including entity, attribute, entity key, relationship and cardinality representations; (2) ER Model of the *implemented* database is suitable for storing the data requirements; (3) Relational Schema of the *implemented* database corresponds to the ER Model; (4) ER Model of the *proposed* database is normalised into 3NF, and functional dependencies are provided;	ER model of the *implemented* database is **outstandingly well suited** for storing the required data for **Levels 1, 2 and 3**, plus one **Level 4** extension task. **All** entities, attributes, relationships are identified with correct cardinality and participation attributes.	ER Model of the *implemented* database is **well suited** for storing the required data for **Levels 1, 2 and 3**, to a satisfactory quality. The **majority** of entities, attributes, relationships are identified with mostly correct cardinality and participation attributes, but there are minor errors or inconsistencies.	ER Model of the *implemented* database is **capable** of storing the required data for **Levels 1 and 2**. There are **clear weaknesses** in the design that limits the effectiveness of the backend database.	ER Model of the *implemented* database is capable of storing the required data for **Level 1**. There are **major drawbacks** in the design.	Insufficient for Poor category.
			Relational schema of the *implemented* database is **valid** and **built according** to the ER Model, **without errors**. Relational Schema contains **all** tables, attributes, and keys.	Relational schema of the *implemented* database is **valid** and **built according** to the ER Model, **without errors**. Relational Schema contains **all** tables, and attributes. There may be **minor errors** with the keys.	Relational schema of the *implemented* database is **valid**, but **may not be built** according to the ER Model. Relational Schema contains **most** tables, and attributes, but a table may be missing. There may be errors with the keys.	Relational schema of the *implemented* database has **major flaws** and **may not be built** according to the ER Model. Relational Schema contains **at least one** table with correct attributes and keys.	
			ER model of the *proposed* database (For Levels, 1, 2, 3 and 4) is **correctly** normalised into **3NF** from the ER Model of the *implemented* database.	ER model of the *proposed* database (For Levels, 1, 2, and 3) is **mostly correctly** normalised into **3NF** from the ER Model of the *implemented* database.	ER model of the *proposed* database (For Levels, 1, and 2) has been normalised into **2NF** from the ER Model of the *implemented* database.	ER model of the *proposed* database **has not** been provided, or has **significant errors**.	
			All Functional Dependencies are provided and show that the ER Model of the *proposed* database is in **3NF**.	**Most** Functional Dependencies are provided and show that the ER Model of the *proposed* database is in **3NF**. Missing functional dependencies may result in a non-3NF model.	Functional Dependencies **are provided** and show that the ER Model of the *proposed* database is in **2NF**.	Functional Dependencies **may not be provided,** or a substantial number of functional dependencies **are missing**.	
Database Implementation & Queries	**5 marks**	(1) SQLite Database implementation correspond to the Relational Schema; (2) Database is correctly populated with pre-processing; (3) SQL Queries (from within Java) are syntactically correct, and are well formatted; (4) SQL Queries (from within Java) execute correctly, and return correct results under all reasonable circumstances; with reasonable user input.	SQLite database is **correctly** implemented according to the relational schema.	SQLite database is **mostly** implemented according to the relational schema. There may be **minor errors** such as missing constraints or foreign key constraints.	SQLite database is **partially** implemented according to the relational schema. There may be **errors** such as missing or inconsistent attributes, and additional tables that are not present in the relational schema.	SQLite database **is not** implemented according to the relational schema.	Insufficient for Poor category.
			Database tables are **correctly** populated. **Excellent** pre-processing is used to prepare raw data for storage, where inconsistencies or problems in raw data are identified and rectified.	The database tables are **correctly** populated. **Suitable** pre-processing is used to prepare raw data for storage, where the majority of inconsistencies or problems in the raw data are identified and rectified.	The database tables are populated. **Limited** pre-processing is used to prepare raw data for storage, where inconsistencies or problems in the raw data are not rectified.	The database tables are populated. Raw data is **not curated** for storage in the database.	
			SQL queries have **no syntactical errors** that prevent the queries from executing successfully. SQL queries **exceptionally** formatted and structured to be easy to interpret. SQL queries do not contain unnecessary instructions or constructs.	SQL queries have **no syntactical errors** that prevent the queries from executing successfully. SQL queries are **suitably** formatted and structured. SQL queries do not contain unnecessary instructions or constructs.	SQL queries have **no syntactical errors** that prevent the queries from executing successfully. SQL queries are formatting or structure that makes the queries **difficult** to understand. SQL queries contain unnecessary instructions and/or constructions.	Some SQL queries **may contain** syntactical errors that prevent the queries from executing successfully. SQL queries are **poorly** formatted or structured. SQL queries contain unnecessary instructions and/or constructions.	
			SQL queries produce the correct result under **all** reasonable circumstances and user input (from the web interface)	SQL queries produce the correct result under **most** reasonable circumstances and user input (from the web interface)	SQL queries produce the correct result for **expected** circumstances and user input (from the web interface), but may have problems for unexpected input.	SQL queries produce the correct result for a **minimal** number of circumstances.	

Java Programming	**5 marks**	(1) The implementation enables the functionality of each Level; (2) The program does not contain error, does not crash, and does not unexpectantly terminate.	The implementation of the Java program enables all of the functionality of **Levels 1, 2 and 3**, plus one **Level 4** extension task to an **outstanding** quality.	The implementation of the Java program enables all of the functionality of **Levels 1, 2 and 3**, to a **satisfactory** quality.	The implementation of the Java program enables all of the functionality of **Levels 1 and 2**, to a **satisfactory** quality.	The implementation of the Java program enables all of the functionality of **Level 1**, to a **satisfactory** quality.	Insufficient for Poor category.
			Java program **does not** contain errors, does not crash, and does not unexpectantly terminate.	Java program does not crash or unexpectantly terminate for **Levels 1, 2 and 3**, but may contain **minor errors**.	Java program does not crash or unexpectantly terminate for **Levels 1 and 2**, but may contain **errors**.	Java program does not crash or unexpectantly terminate for **Level 1**, but may contain **errors**.	
Usability Testing	**5 marks**	(1) Usability tests are conducted; (2) Usability tests are tied to Persona(s) and Context Scenarios; (3) Usability tests have completed instructions; (4) PIFs are prepared and inform the participants of their activity and rights during the usability test(s); (5) Participants have completed PIFs; (6) Survey for the participants to complete captures evidence from which to re-design at least one element of the web application.	Preparation material is **submitted on-time** for Milestone 2. Preparation material is used for usability testing **without** modification.	Preparation material is **submitted on-time** for Milestone 2. Preparation material is used for usability testing **without significant** modification.	Preparation material is **submitted on-time** for Milestone 2. Preparation material is used for usability testing **with** significant modification.	Preparation material is **submitted late** for Milestone 2, or is not submitted.	Insufficient for Poor category.
			At least three (3) usability tests have been conducted with an outstanding set of tasks that cover **Levels 1, 2, and 3**.	**At least two (2)** usability tests have been conducted with a satisfactory set of tasks that cover **Levels 1 and 2**.	**At least one (1)** usability test has been conducted with a satisfactory set of tasks that cover **Levels 1 and 2**.	**At least one (1)** usability test has been conducted with a satisfactory set of tasks that cover **Level 1**.	
			Each usability test (**for Levels 1, 2 and 3**): (1) is tied to at least one Persona; (2) tied to at least one Context Scenario; (3) have complete instructions for the participant to follow.	**Each** usability test (**for Levels 1 and 2**): (1) is tied to at least one Persona of the website; (2) tied to at least one Context Scenario for the website; (3) have complete instructions for the participant to follow.	**At least one** usability test (**for Levels 1 and 2**): (1) is tied to at least one Persona of the website; (2) tied to at least one Context Scenario for the website; (3) have instructions for the participant to follow.	**At least one** usability test (**for Level 1**): (1) is tied to at least one Persona of the website; (2) tied to at least one Context Scenario for the website; (3) have instructions for the participant to follow.	
			PIFs **fully** inform the participant of their activity and rights for the usability testing. All participants have completed PIFs.	PIFs **suitably** inform the participant of their activity and rights for the usability testing. All participants have completed PIFs.	PIFs **do not appropriately** inform the participant of their activity for the usability testing. All participants have completed PIFs.	PIFs are **prepared**. All participants have completed PIFs.	
			Participants have completed an **outstanding** survey that captures **all** relevant evidence from which to re-design at least one element of the web application.	Participants have completed a **satisfactory** survey that captures **sufficient** evidence from which to re-design at least one element of the web application.	Participants have completed a **satisfactory** survey that captures evidence from which to re-design at least one element of the web application, with **problems** in interpreting this evidence.	Participants of the usability tests have **completed** a survey.	
Milestone 4	**Weight**	**Elements**	**Excellent (5)**	**Good (4)**	**Fair (3)**	**Poor (1.5)**	**NN (0)**
Presentation Skills	**5 marks**	(1) Presentation Structure and Engagement; (2) Use of slides, diagrams, code examples, and other visualisations; (3) Preparation of the presentation	The demonstration presents the functionality of **all** implemented levels (Levels 1-4) and sub-tasks, including the (1) the UX/UI implementation, the (2) Database implementation; and (3) the Java program.	The demonstration presents the **majority** of the functionality of all implemented levels (Levels 1-4) and sub-tasks, including the (1) the UX/UI implementation, the (2) Database implementation; and (3) the Java program.	The demonstration presents the **some** of the functionality of all implemented levels (Levels 1-4) and sub-tasks, including the (1) the UX/UI implementation, the (2) Database implementation; and (3) the Java program.	The demonstration presents the **minimal** functionality of all implemented levels (Levels 1-4) and sub-tasks, including the (1) the UX/UI implementation, the (2) Database implementation; and (3) the Java program.	Insufficient for Poor category.
			Presentation is **exceptionally** well structured, engaging, and clear to follow.	Presentation is **well** structured and engaging with little confusion.	Presentation is **adequately** structured but does not flow well at times.	Presentation is **difficult** to follow and doesn't flows well. It is barely structured.	
			Excellent use of visualisations which are easy to follow and interpret.	**Sufficient** use visualisations which can be followed.	Visualisations are **difficult** to follow at times.	Use of appropriate visualisations is **absent**.	
			Presentation is **fully** prepared, with all material readily at hand.	Presentation is **sufficiently** prepared.	Presentation is **prepared**, but the presenters must find material to present, leaving the audience waiting.	Presentation is **not adequately** prepared..	
			Audience is given an **outstanding** summary of how the presenter's website addresses the social challenge.	Audience is given a **satisfactory** summary of how the presenter's website addresses the social challenge.	Audience is given a summary of how the presenter's website addresses the social challenge, with **missing elements**, or **inconsistencies**.	Audience is given a **limited** summary of how the presenter's website addresses the social challenge.	
Teamwork & Peer Assessment	**5 marks**	(1) Teamwork Peer Assessment and Contribution Document; (2) Organisation: regularity of activity, timeframe of completion of tasks; (3) Contribution: distribution, quality, and regularity; (4) Communication: regularity and suitability; (5) Teamwork is conducted over the entire course of the assessment.	Team member has **completed** the Peer Assessment.	Team member has **completed** the Peer Assessment.	Team member has **completed** the Peer Assessment.	Team member **may not** have completed the Peer Assessment.	Insufficient for Poor category.
			Team has **completed** Contribution Document.	Team has **completed** Contribution Document.	Team has **completed** Contribution Document.	Team **may not** have completed Contribution Document.	
			Team member has **significant** activity, and **regular** completion of tasks over the **entire** course of the assessment as evident through MS Teams and the team Git repository.	Team member has **satisfactory** activity, and **regular** completion of tasks for the **majority** of the assessment, as evident through MS Teams and the team Git repository.	Team member has **some lack** of regular activity, and/or late completion of tasks **at times** during the assessment, as evident through MS Teams and the team Git repository.	Team member has **sporadic** or late activity, and/or an **untimely** completion of tasks, throughout the assessment as evident through MS Teams and the team Git repository.	
			Team member has **significant** and **regular** contribution to **all** components of the project over the **entire** course of the assessment as evident on MS Teams, the team Git repository, and the Contribution Document.	Team member has a **satisfactory** contribution to the **majority** of the components of the project for the **majority** of the assessment as evident on MS Teams, the team Git repository, and the Contribution Document.	Team member has **some lack** of regular contribution to components of the project, and **some lack** of regular contribution **at times** during the assessment as evident on MS Teams, the team Git repository, and the Contribution Document.	Team member has **some contribution** to project, but the contributions are **minimally sufficient** and on an irregular basis throughout the assessment as evident on MS Teams, the team Git repository, and the Contribution Document.	
			Team member maintains **regular** communication with the other team member(s) over the entire course of the assessment as evident on MS Teams.	Team member has **satisfactory** communication with the other team member(s) for the majority of the assessment as evident on MS Teams.	Team member has **some lack** of regular communication with the other team member(s) at times during the assessment as evident on MS Teams.	Team member has **minimal, inconsistent and/or irregular** communication with the other team member(s) throughout the assessment as evident on MS Teams.	