



Course Code : SWE310
Course Name : Programming Elective II (2): .NET
Lecturer : Teo Bee Guan
Academic Session : 2025/04
Assessment Title : Group Project
Submission Due Date : 08/07/2025

Prepared by :	Student ID	Student Name
	SWE2209841	Caleb Lau Lik Hung
	SWE2209843	Jordan Lee Yung Chen
	SWE2209845	Ong Wen Zheng
	SWE2209987	Ho Xin Yi

Date Received : _____

Feedback from Lecturer:

Mark:

Own Work Declaration

I/We hereby understand my/our work would be checked for plagiarism or other misconduct, and the softcopy would be saved for future comparison(s).

I/We hereby confirm that all the references or sources of citations have been correctly listed or presented and I/we clearly understand the serious consequence caused by any intentional or unintentional misconduct.

This work is not made on any work of other students (past or present), and it has not been submitted to any other courses or institutions before.

Signature:

(Caleb Lau Lik Hung) (Ong Wen Zheng) (Ho Xin Yi) (Jordan Lee Yung Chen)

Date: 08/07/2025

Onedrive link

[PE \(II\) Group Project](#)

APPENDIX 1

MARKING RUBRICS

Component Title	Group Project					Mark	100
Criteria	Score and Descriptors					Weight (%)	Marks
	Excellent (25-30)	Good (18-24)	Average (12-17)	Need Improvement (6-11)	Poor (0-5)		
Part 1 (Core Feature Implementation)	All core features fully implemented and working smoothly (task, status, project, comment, dashboard)	Most features implemented with minor issues	Basic task management works; limited in other features	Only task creation and listing work; missing advanced features	Barely functional or mostly incomplete	30	
	Excellent (13-15)	Good (10-12)	Average (7-9)	Need Improvement (4-6)	Poor (0-3)		
Part 1 (Authentication & Role Control)	Secure login + registration + role-based access (e.g., Admin/User); JWT used properly	Basic auth working, minor security/logical flaws	Login works, but no roles or token handling.	Incomplete or insecure login only	Not working or missing entirely	15	
Part 1 (CRUD API Coverage)	Full CRUD for tasks, users, projects; RESTful and consistent	Mostly complete with few missing endpoints	Limited CRUD; some endpoints not tested	Only basic GET or POST works	CRUD operations missing or broken	15	
	Excellent (9-10)	Good (7-8)	Average (5-6)	Need Improvement (3-4)	Poor (0-2)		
Part 1 (Validation & Error Handling)	Both frontend and backend validations; user-friendly error feedback	Mostly covered; some error paths unclear or unhandled	Basic validation present, error handling inconsistent	Few validations; many silent or unhandled errors	No validation; app crashes or misbehaves frequently	10	

	Excellent (9-10)	Good (7-8)	Average (5-6)	Need Improvement (3-4)	Poor (0-2)	
Part 2 (Content Coverage)	Covers all required sections (title, problem, features, architecture, demo, conclusion)	Covers most key areas with good structure	Covers basics; some areas lack clarity or depth	Misses several important sections	Incomplete or irrelevant content	10
Part 2 (Clarity & Delivery)	Clear voice, confident posture, natural flow; good pacing; presenters are well-prepared	Mostly clear; occasional stumbles; overall good presentation	Understandable, but includes frequent pauses or confusion	Hard to follow, low confidence, unclear speaking	Mumbled or disengaged; hard to understand	10
Part 2 (Visual Aids)	Uses clear, consistent visuals (slides, diagrams, screenshots); visually appealing	visuals (slides, diagrams, screenshots); visually appealing. Visuals mostly clear and helpful; minor inconsistencies	Basic visuals, lacks consistency or polish	Cluttered slides or missing key visuals	No visuals or unreadable slides	10