

## COSC2803 2023 Semester 2 | 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;	The implementation of the UX/UI enables the requirements of <b>Level 1, 2 and 3</b> , plus one <b>Level 4</b> extension task to an <b>outstanding</b> quality.	The implementation of the UX/UI enables the requirements of <b>Levels 1, 2 and 3</b> , to a <b>satisfactory</b> quality.	The implementation of the UX/UI enables the requirements of <b>Levels 1 and 2</b> , to a <b>satisfactory</b> quality.	The implementation of the UX/UI enables the requirements of <b>Level 1</b> , to a <b>satisfactory</b> quality.	Insufficient for Poor category.
		(2) UX/UI Implementation satisfies relevant Context Scenarios tied to the relevant Personas;	The UX/UI clearly enables <b>all relevant</b> Personas to accomplish <b>all relevant</b> Context Scenarios. All Personas and Context Scenarios are <b>highly relevant</b> to the social challenge.	The UX/UI enables <b>all relevant</b> Personas to accomplish <b>all relevant</b> Context Scenarios. All Personas and Context Scenarios are <b>relevant</b> to the social challenge.	The UX/UI enables <b>some relevant</b> Personas to accomplish <b>some relevant</b> Context Scenarios, with issues or inconsistencies. <b>Most</b> Personas and Context Scenarios are relevant to the social challenge.	The UX/UI enables <b>at least one</b> relevant Personas to accomplish at least one relevant Context Scenarios, with <b>significant issues or inconsistencies</b> .	
		(3) UX/UI Implementation satisfies Nielsen design heuristics and/or makes appropriate trade-offs;	UX/UI implementation <b>satisfies</b> Nielsen design principles. Any trade-offs of design principles are <b>fully justified</b> .	UX/UI implementation <b>satisfies</b> Nielsen design principles. Any trade-offs of design principles are <b>sufficiently justified</b> .	UX/UI implementation satisfies Nielsen design principles, with <b>issues or inconsistencies</b> . Any trade-offs of design principles <b>may not</b> be justified.	UX/UI implementation satisfies some Nielsen design principles, but has <b>significant issues</b> . Any trade-offs of design principles <b>may not</b> be justified.	
		(4) UX/UI Implementation employs appropriate UI Design Patterns in (but not limited to) Navigation, Page Layout and Interaction patterns;	UX/UI implementation <b>outstandingly</b> and <b>consistently</b> applies <b>multiple relevant</b> UX/UI Design patterns across the <b>entire</b> website.	UX/UI implementation <b>satisfactorily</b> and <b>consistently</b> applies relevant UX/UI Design patterns across the <b>entire</b> website.	UX/UI implementation <b>satisfactorily</b> applies UX/UI Design patterns with <b>inconsistencies</b> across the entire website.	UX/UI implementation <b>does not</b> apply suitable UX/UI Design patterns.	
		(5) UX/UI element has been redesigned based on Usability testing feedback.	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 <b>clear improvement</b> .	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 <b>satisfactory improvement</b> .	At least one element of the UX/UI has been redesigned and reimplemented based on feedback from the usability testing. The redesign <b>may not</b> provide an improvement.	The UX/UI has been <b>may not</b> have been changed based on feedback from the usability testing.	
Database Modelling	5 marks	(1) ER Models of the <i>implemented</i> and <i>proposed</i> 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;	ER model of the <i>implemented</i> database is <b>outstandingly well suited</b> for storing the required data for <b>Levels 1, 2 and 3</b> , plus one <b>Level 4</b> extension task. <b>All</b> entities, attributes, relationships are identified with correct cardinality and participation attributes.	ER Model of the <i>implemented</i> database is <b>well suited</b> for storing the required data for <b>Levels 1, 2 and 3</b> , to a satisfactory quality. The <b>majority</b> of entities, attributes, relationships are identified with mostly correct cardinality and participation attributes, but there are minor errors or inconsistencies.	ER Model of the <i>implemented</i> database is <b>capable</b> of storing the required data for <b>Levels 1 and 2</b> . There are <b>clear weaknesses</b> in the design that limits the effectiveness of the backend database.	ER Model of the <i>implemented</i> database is capable of storing the required data for <b>Level 1</b> . There are <b>major drawbacks</b> in the design.	Insufficient for Poor category.
		(2) ER Model of the <i>implemented</i> database is suitable for storing the data requirements;	Relational schema of the <i>implemented</i> database is <b>valid</b> and <b>built according</b> to the ER Model, <b>without errors</b> . Relational Schema contains <b>all</b> tables, attributes, and keys.	Relational schema of the <i>implemented</i> database is <b>valid</b> and <b>built according</b> to the ER Model, <b>without errors</b> . Relational Schema contains <b>all</b> tables, and attributes. There may be <b>minor errors</b> with the keys.	Relational schema of the <i>implemented</i> database is <b>valid</b> , but <b>may not be built</b> according to the ER Model. Relational Schema contains <b>most</b> tables, and attributes, but a table may be missing. There may be errors with the keys.	Relational schema of the <i>implemented</i> database has <b>major flaws</b> and <b>may not be built</b> according to the ER Model. Relational Schema contains <b>at least one</b> table with correct attributes and keys.	
		(3) Relational Schema of the <i>implemented</i> database corresponds to the ER Model;	Database Schema of the <i>proposed</i> database (For Levels, 1, 2, 3 and 4) is <b>correctly</b> normalised into <b>3NF</b> from the ER Model of the <i>implemented</i> database.	Database Schema of the <i>proposed</i> database (For Levels, 1, 2, and 3) is <b>mostly correctly</b> normalised into <b>3NF</b> from the ER Model of the <i>implemented</i> database.	Database Schema of the <i>proposed</i> database (For Levels, 1, and 2) has been normalised into <b>2NF</b> from the ER Model of the <i>implemented</i> database.	Database Schema of the <i>proposed</i> database <b>has not been provided</b> , or has <b>significant errors</b> .	
		(4) ER Model of the <i>proposed</i> database is normalised into 3NF, and functional dependencies are provided;	<b>All</b> Functional Dependencies are provided and show that the ER Model of the <i>proposed</i> database is in <b>3NF</b> .	<b>Most</b> Functional Dependencies are provided and show that the ER Model of the <i>proposed</i> database is in <b>3NF</b> . Missing functional dependencies may result in a non-3NF model.	Functional Dependencies <b>are provided</b> and show that the ER Model of the <i>proposed</i> database is in <b>2NF</b> .	Functional Dependencies <b>may not be provided</b> , or a substantial number of functional dependencies <b>are missing</b> .	
Database Implementation & Queries	5 marks	(1) SQLite Database implementation correspond to the Relational Schema;	SQLite database is <b>correctly</b> implemented according to the relational schema.	SQLite database is <b>mostly</b> implemented according to the relational schema. There may be <b>minor errors</b> such as missing constraints or foreign key constraints.	SQLite database is <b>partially</b> implemented according to the relational schema. There may be <b>errors</b> such as missing or inconsistent attributes, and additional tables that are not present in the relational schema.	SQLite database is <b>not</b> implemented according to the relational schema.	Insufficient for Poor category.
		(2) Database is correctly populated with pre-processing;	Database tables are <b>correctly</b> populated. <b>Excellent</b> 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 <b>correctly</b> populated. <b>Suitable</b> 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. <b>Limited</b> 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 <b>not curated</b> for storage in the database.	
		(3) SQL Queries (from within Java) are syntactically correct, and are well formatted;	SQL queries have <b>no syntactical errors</b> that prevent the queries from executing successfully. SQL queries <b>exceptionally</b> formatted and structured to be easy to interpret. SQL queries do not contain unnecessary instructions or constructs.	SQL queries have <b>no syntactical errors</b> that prevent the queries from executing successfully. SQL queries are <b>suitably</b> formatted and structured. SQL queries do not contain unnecessary instructions or constructs.	SQL queries have <b>no syntactical errors</b> that prevent the queries from executing successfully. SQL queries are formatting or structure that makes the queries <b>difficult</b> to understand. SQL queries contain unnecessary instructions and/or constructions.	Some SQL queries <b>may contain</b> syntactical errors that prevent the queries from executing successfully. SQL queries are <b>poorly</b> formatted or structured. SQL queries contain unnecessary instructions and/or constructions.	
		(4) SQL Queries (from within Java) execute correctly, and return correct results under all reasonable circumstances; with reasonable user input.	SQL queries produce the correct result under <b>all</b> reasonable circumstances and user input (from the web interface)	SQL queries produce the correct result under <b>most</b> reasonable circumstances and user input (from the web interface)	SQL queries produce the correct result for <b>expected</b> circumstances and user input (from the web interface), but may have problems for unexpected input.	SQL queries produce the correct result for a <b>minimal</b> number of circumstances.	

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