

XIAMEN UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA



Course Code : SOF202
Course Name : Database
Lecturer : Dr. Subashini A/P Ganapathy
Academic Session : 2025/09
Assessment Title : Lab Report
Submission Due Date : 19 December 2025

Prepared by :

Student ID	Student Name
DSC2409007	Deng Kailong (Leader)
DSC2409009	Du Zhixuan
DSC2409026	Min Yiduo
DSC2409027	Pan Ziliang
DSC2409033	Tao Ouwen

Date Received :

Feedback from Lecturer:	Mark:
-------------------------	-------

Own Work Declaration

I/We acknowledge that my/our work will be examined for plagiarism or any other form of academic misconduct, and that the digital copy of the work may be retained for future comparisons.

I/We confirm that all sources cited in this work have been correctly acknowledged and that I/we fully understand the serious consequences of any intentional or unintentional academic misconduct.

In addition, I/we affirm that this submission does not contain any materials generated by AI tools, including direct copying and pasting of text or paraphrasing. This work is my/our original creation, and it has not been based on any work of other students (past or present), nor has it been previously submitted to any other course or institution.

Signature:

邓楷诚 木智轩 阮一多 潘子良
陶政文

Date: 10 December 2025

Contents

Project Gantt Chart and Milestones	1
Task 1 Requirement Analysis	1
1.1 Problem Statement	1
References	2
Marking Rubric	

Task 1 Requirement Analysis

1.1 Problem Statement

The university sports complex currently relies on outdated methods such as manual registration and spreadsheets to manage equipment, facilities, coaches, and bookings. This has led to issues including double bookings, missing records, and difficulties in tracking equipment maintenance(Frank, Buhmann, & Basin, 2013).

References

- Frank, M., Buhmann, J. M., & Basin, D. (2013). *Role mining with probabilistic models*. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/1212.4775>

APPENDIX 1
MARKING RUBRICS

Component Title	Lab Report (Grouping)					Percentage (%)	24%
Criteria	Score and Descriptors					Weight	Marks
	Excellent (9.0 – 10.0)	Good (7.0 – 8.5)	Average (5.0 – 6.5)	Need Improvement (3.0 – 4.5)	Poor (0 – 2.5)		
Task 1: Database Integrity (20 Marks)	All CREATE TABLE commands are accurate; all integrity constraints correctly applied. Screenshots complete, clear, and well-organized. Explanations are thorough and show strong understanding.	Most tables and constraints are correctly implemented; minor errors. Screenshots provided and generally clear. Explanations show good understanding but lack depth.	Some tables correctly created; constraints may be incomplete or partially wrong. Screenshots provided. Explanations are basic.	Many constraints incorrect or missing. Screenshots unclear or incomplete. Explanations lack clarity and accuracy.	Incomplete or inaccurate SQL statements. Little or no screenshots. Weak or missing explanations.	20	
Task 2: SQL Implementation (30 Marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All remaining CREATE TABLE commands are fully correct and clearly shown with screenshots. All tables populated with 6–10 valid rows each. All SQL categories include 3 correct queries each, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CREATE TABLE commands mostly correct with minor errors. Tables filled properly with 6–10 rows each. Most SQL categories include 3 correct queries (some minor mistakes allowed). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some CREATE TABLE commands incomplete or inaccurate. Tables partially populated (some missing rows or incorrect data). SQL categories include fewer than 3 correct queries or have notable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CREATE TABLE commands contain multiple mistakes or missing screenshots. Many tables not properly populated. Several SQL categories missing or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Missing or incorrect CREATE TABLE commands. Very little or no data inserted. SQL queries missing, incorrect, or not executed. Screenshots mostly missing. 	30	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> executed without errors. Screenshots of queries and outputs are complete, clear, and well-organized. Demonstrates excellent understanding of SQL, filtering, joins, arithmetic expressions, and formatting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Screenshots are provided but may lack full clarity or formatting. Shows good understanding but misses depth in a few areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> syntax/output issues. Screenshots provided but not consistent or clear. Understanding is present but basic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> incorrectly executed. Screenshots unclear, incomplete, or missing outputs. Limited understanding of SQL syntax and application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows minimal or no understanding of SQL concepts. 	
Task 3: Triggering (15 Marks)	Both triggers fully correct and functional. BEFORE/AFTER results clearly demonstrated with proper screenshots. No syntax errors.	Two triggers implemented with minor mistakes. Evidence provided for BEFORE/AFTER. Screenshots mostly clear.	One trigger corrects, the second partially implemented. Limited or basic BEFORE/AFTER evidence.	Triggers contain multiple errors; screenshots unclear or incomplete. Limited understanding shown.	Triggers missing, non-functional, or incorrect. No valid evidence provided.	15
Task 4: Access Control (15 Marks)	Two access control mechanisms implemented correctly. Permissions tested and verified with clear screenshots. Demonstrates strong security understanding.	Both mechanisms implemented with minor issues. Screenshots provided and mostly clear. Verification mostly correct	One mechanism corrects, the other partially correct. Screenshots basic or incomplete.	Incorrect or incomplete access control commands. Screenshots unclear or missing verification	Access control incorrectly implemented or not attempted. No valid evidence.	15