| **INB201 - Final Project - Marking Criteria** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Performance Grade-Level** | | | | |
|  | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3-2-1** |
| Tracking of Patient Medical and Clinical Data (weighting: 20 raw marks) | * Implements 5 or more patient tracking processes * Is professional and has highly usable intuitive user interface that is very easy to use * All or almost all acceptance tests pass during testing | * Implements 4 or 5 patient tracking processes * Is mostly professional and has an intuitive user interface that is easy to use * The large majority of acceptance tests pass | * Implements 3 or 4 patient tracking processes * Has a good user interface that is not difficult to use * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some warning messages. | * Implements 2 or 3 patient tracking processes * Has a basic user interface * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some error messages. | * Implements 1 or 2 patient tracking processes * Has a non-intuitive user interface * Some of the acceptance tests pass. The system crashes during testing. |
|  | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3-2-1** |
| Tracking of Patient Financial Data (weighting: 20 raw marks) | * Implements 5 or more billable items * Patient account information is very easy to query & update * Is professional and has highly usable intuitive user interface that is very easy to use * All or almost all acceptance tests pass during testing | * Implements 4 or 5 billable items * Patient account information is mostly easy to query & update * Is mostly professional and has an intuitive user interface that is easy to use * The large majority of acceptance tests pass | * Implements 3 or 4 billable items * Patient account information is moderately easy to query & update * Has a good user interface that is not difficult to use * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some warning messages. | * Implements 2 or 3 billable items * Patient account information is ok to query but not to update * Has a basic user interface * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some error messages. | * Implements 1 or 2 billable items * Patient account information is not easy to query or update * Has a non-intuitive user interface * Some of the acceptance tests pass. The system crashes during testing. |
| Access Control depending on user role (weighting: 20 raw marks) | * Implements 5 or more access roles with associated user stories and processes * Each role has been well designed and integrated seamlessly into the system such that access to the system is appropriate to each role. * System Administrators can query and update roles | * Implements 4 or 5 access roles with associated user stories and processes * Each role has been designed and integrated into the system such that access to the system is appropriate to each role. * System Administrators can query and update roles | * Implements 3 or 4 access roles with associated user stories and processes * Most roles have been designed and integrated into the system such that access to the system is appropriate to each role. * System Administrators can query and update roles | * Implements 2 or 3 access roles with associated user stories and processes * Some roles have been designed and integrated into the system such that access to the system is appropriate to each role. * System Administrators can query and update roles | * Implements 1 or 2 access roles with associated user stories and processes * No roles have been integrated into the system * System Administrators cannot query and/or update roles |
|  | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3-2-1** |
| Hospital Resource Scheduler (weighting: 20 raw marks) | * Is able to timetable 5 or more types of hospital resources * Is professional and has highly usable intuitive user interface that is very easy to use * All or almost all acceptance tests pass during testing | * Is able to timetable 4 or 5 types of hospital resources * Is mostly professional and has an intuitive user interface that is easy to use * The large majority of acceptance tests pass | * Is able to timetable 3 or 4 types of hospital resources * Has a good user interface that is not difficult to use * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some warning messages. | * Is able to timetable 2 or 3 types of hospital resources * Has a basic user interface * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some error messages. | * Is able to timetable 1 or 2 types of hospital resources * Has a non-intuitive user interface * Some of the acceptance tests pass. The system crashes during testing. |
| Exporting of Data (weighting: 8 raw marks) | * Able to export all relevant patient data to PDF file(s) * All or almost all acceptance tests pass during testing | * Able to export almost all relevant patient data to PDF file(s) * The large majority of acceptance tests pass | * Able to export most relevant patient data to PDF file(s) * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some warning messages. | * Able to export basic patient data to PDF file(s) * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some error messages. | * Able to export little or no patient data to PDF file(s) * Some of the acceptance tests pass. The system crashes during testing. |
|  | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3-2-1** |
| Hospital Administrators: Querying and Reporting of Data (weighting: 20 raw marks) | * Implements 5 or more reports and/or statistical results, using query parameter values selected by the user (Hospital Administrator) * Is professional and has highly usable intuitive user interface that is very easy to use * All or almost all acceptance tests pass during testing | * Implements 4 or 5 reports and/or statistical results, using query parameter values selected by the user (Hospital Administrator) * Is mostly professional and has an intuitive user interface that is easy to use * The large majority of acceptance tests pass | * Implements 3 or 4 reports and/or statistical results, using query parameter values selected by the user (Hospital Administrator) * Has a good user interface that is not difficult to use * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some warning messages. | * Implements 2 or 3 reports and/or statistical results, using query parameter values selected by the user (Hospital Administrator) * Has a basic user interface * The majority of acceptance tests pass. The system produces some error messages. | * Implements 1 or 2 reports and/or statistical results, or does not allow query parameter values to be selected by the user (Hospital Administrator) * Has a non-intuitive user interface * Some of the acceptance tests pass. The system crashes during testing. |
| Code Quality (weighting: 10 raw marks) | * Source code is consistently of a high quality, all code follows a specified coding standard and is well formatted and commented | * Source code is almost all of a high quality; almost all code follows a specified coding standard and is reasonably commented. | * Source code is mostly of a high quality, sometimes follows a specified coding standard and is mostly commented. | * Source code is partially of a high quality, and a coding standard is partially followed. Code is briefly commented. | * Source code is consistently not of a high quality, no coding standard is consistently followed and comments are sparse. |
|  | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3-2-1** |
| Documentation Coverage and Quality (weighting: 10 raw marks) | * ALL the required documentation is submitted * The report overall is presented professionally (Table of Contents, page number, section titles, sufficient tables and figures, etc.) | * Most of the required documentation is submitted * The report is presented very well with minor formatting inconsistencies (Table of Contents, page number, section titles, sufficient tables and figures, etc.) | * Some of the required documentation is submitted * The report is presented fairly well with 2-3 of the following items missing: Table of Contents, page number, section titles, sufficient tables and figures. | * Only a little of the required documentation is submitted * The report is presented with major formatting inconsistencies or most of the following items are missing: Table of Contents, page number, section titles, sufficient tables and figures. | * Report not submitted * The report does not have any of the followings: Table of Contents, page number, section titles, sufficient tables and figures. |
| Test Plan and User documentation (weighting: 10 raw marks) | * Acceptance Test Plan is very well organised and comprehensive, including all user interfaces. * User Guides are very well structured and writing is of the highest professional standard. | * Acceptance Test Plan is well organised and comprehensive, including all user interfaces. * User Guides are well structured and writing is of a reasonably high standard. | * Acceptance Test Plan is well organised and includes most user interfaces. * User Guides are reasonably structured, covers required material and is easy to understand. | * Acceptance Test Plan includes some user interfaces. * User Guides are grammatically correct and no spelling errors occur. | * Acceptance Test Plan is poor, including a 1 or 2 user interfaces. * User Guides are not grammatically correct and spelling errors occur. |
|  | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3-2-1** |
| Consistency of documentation with the final working system (5 raw marks) | * ALL documentation is up-to-date and consistent with the actual system | * Most documentation is up-to-date and consistent with the actual system | * Some of the documentation is up-to-date and consistent with the actual system | * Only a little of the documentation is up-to-date and consistent with the actual system | * Documentation is completely different from the actual system |
|  | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3-2-1** |
| Final Submission includes a demo of the working system – see item 3 in the project description’s **What to Submit** (5 raw marks) | * Demo is comprehensive, easy to follow, and consistent with the actual system | * Demo is mostly complete, mostly easy to follow, and consistent with the actual system | * Demo is somewhat incomplete, or not easy to follow, but is still consistent with the actual system | * Demo covers only part of the system, or is not easy to follow, but is still consistent with the actual system | * Demo is missing or very incomplete, or hard to follow, or inconsistent with the actual system |
| Presentation of the Final Project (weighting: 12 raw marks)  Note: this is ***not*** the only aspect that will be evaluated during your team’s presentation at the end of semester. Failure to actually give a presentation will result in a loss of at least half of the marks for your Final Project. I.e. at least 25% out of the 50% weighting (assessment item 3 in the unit outline). | * The presentation is well organised, and the people are well briefed on their roles and the information needed. The process is slick and clearly impressive. * There are no glitches in the presentation. * There may be glitches that show up in response to questions or due to infrastructure outside of the team’s control, but the team manages to recover quickly and smoothly. | * The presentation is well organised. The process is slick and clearly impressive. * There are no significant glitches in the presentation, and any that do appear are easily managed by the team without noticeable interruption. * There may be glitches that show up in response to questions or due to infrastructure outside of the team’s control, but the team manages to recover fairly smoothly. | * The presentation is well organised, but its execution is not always slick or reliable. * There are some small glitches from which the team recovers fairly easily but they are not handled as smoothly as possible. * There may be glitches that show up in response to questions or due to infrastructure outside of the team’s control, and the team manages to recover but not smoothly. | * The presentation is reasonably organised, but the overall structure is modest and there are some issues. * There may be some stories executed with slickness, but there are problems with the system and it is not up to a professional standard. * There may be glitches that show up in response to questions or due to infrastructure outside of the team’s control, and the team struggles to recover. | * The presentation is poorly organised. * The system has serious problems or failure. * The presentation does not demonstrate a professional approach. * The team stumbles when glitches occur. * The team is not able to recover reasonably quickly when problems occur. |
| Total:  160 raw marks |  |  |  |  |  |