

GMT 320, Geoinformatics project
Evaluation – Final project demonstrations

Project team:

Percentage complete:

Criteria	1=Little evidence of understanding, but some effort	2=Below expectations	3=Meets expectations	4=Above expectations	5=Exceptional effort	Mark	Weight
Technology – Integration and use of various technologies and tools.	No tools were used.	Only one technology or tools were used.	The entire stack was implemented (e.g. PostgreSQL, GeoServer and API).	The entire stack was implemented with additional technology.	The entire stack was implemented with custom technologies developed.		10%
Scripting and implementation – Adding functionality to display, events and triggers.	No JS API included, functionality hardcoded in HTML	Site developed using tools, and no development was done	Site developed using tools or custom website with HTML, additional functionalities implemented with JS	Custom web mapping application developed with HTML, JS and PHP	Advance functionalities implemented with HTML, JS and PHP		15%
Map functionality – Basic zoom, pan. Can the user click on a feature to get information about that feature?	Static maps.	Zoom and pan works.	Info works for a single layer.	Info works for multiple layers.	Advanced functionality, e.g. show information for all features underneath.		5%
Spatial analysis – What analysis was done and how it is incorporated in to the web map.	No analysis.	Results of analysis can be shown in a desktop product.	Results of analysis is displayed on online map.	Results of analysis can be updated, though the database or user input.	Advanced functionality, e.g. map updates automatically.		15%
Search - Can a user search for an address (dwelling number)?	No search functionality.	Single text string search.	Works if the search phrase matches exactly what is in the database.	Search with multiple criteria.	Advanced search, e.g. Google-type search.		10%

Usability - User interface is simple and natural to use. Error checking implemented when submitting.	Insufficient	Some problems	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	5%
3D model – Was a 3D model implemented? Does it compliment the project?	No 3D model was implemented.	Basic 3D model was implemented, showing dwellings.	3D model with dwellings and additional information.	Advanced 3D model was implemented. Creative use of the 3D model	3D model implemented using alternative coding options, for example CesiumJS.	10%
Cartographic principles (hard copy maps) - Map layout and design: Does the map have a suitable legend, scale, letter sizes, typography, colour, symbols, projection, index map, title? Readability: Is the map readable? Suitable balance of map elements, visual contrast, graphic density, effective choice of colours, image/background contrast? Overall impression: Are the maps visually appealing?	Insufficient	Some problems	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	15%
Aesthetics - The solution is visually appealing; components are laid out sensibly on the screen.	Insufficient	Some problems	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	5%
Blog	Insufficient	Some problems	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	10%
Comments						