

CRITERIA		MEETS CRITERIA [A,B,C,...,F]						
Requirement Analysis and Design			A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Stakeholder analysis with use case diagram and descriptions	A	Excellent identification of all stakeholders of the systems with requirements and mapping them into external users in the use case diagram. <i>Correct</i>	Very good identification of all most all stakeholders of the systems with requirements and mapping them into external users in the use case diagram. <i>Correct</i>	Good identification of most stakeholders of the systems with requirements and mapping them into external users in the use case diagram. <i>Correct</i>	Some identification of stakeholders of the systems with requirements and mapping them into external users in the use case diagram. Identification of use cases and <i>some relationships between use cases</i>	Erroneous identification of stakeholders of the systems with requirements and mapping them into external users in the use case diagram. <i>Identification</i>	The presented designs do not map the UML standards. Incorrect identification and <i>mapping of requirements</i>
2	Activity diagram and Sequence diagram	B						
3	Class digaram	A						
Implementation			Excellent mapping of the designs to code incorporating all necessary OOP concepts. Good integration of all functional units into a single application. Good coding practices such as commenting, version controlling and adherence to naming standards followed through out the application. <i>standards followed through out</i>	Very good mapping of the designs to code incorporating all necessary OOP concepts. Good coding practices such as commenting, version controlling and adherence to naming standards followed through out the application. <i>Good integration of all</i>	Fair level of mapping the designs to code incorporating some of necessary OOP concepts. Some good coding practices such as commenting, version controlling and adherence to naming standards followed but not all met through out the application. Some <i>integration of functional units into</i>	Some level of mapping the designs to code incorporating some of necessary OOP concepts. Only a limited or no good coding practices such as commenting, version controlling and adherence to naming standards followed. No or partial integration of functional units into a single application. No exception handling <i>and no input validations. Correct outout</i>	No level of mapping the designs to code. Some of necessary OOP concepts used with errors. Only a limited or no good coding practices such as commenting, version controlling and adherence to naming standards followed. No or partial <i>integration of functional units</i>	No implementaion provided or major errors in the application which does not execute as expected.
4	Appropriate use of OOP concepts and adherence to coding principles/standards/norms	B						
5	Correct mapping of the designs into code with integration	A						
6	Exception/error handling and version controlling	A	Excellent test plan covering all aspects of the project and functions. Good documentation provided which follows formal report writing style and formatting.	Good test plan covering all aspects of the project and functions. Good documentation provided which follows formal report writing style and formatting.	Test plan covering most aspects of the project and functions. Fair level of documentation provided which some what follows formal report writing style and formatting.	Some test plan covering some aspects of the project and functions. Documentation provided which does not follow formal report writing style and formatting.	Some test plan covering only a few aspects of the project and functions. Document does not follow formal report writing standards. Missing sections and formatting.	No test plan. Missing sections and formatting or no document provided.
Testing and Documentation								
7	Test plans	A						
8	Clear presentation of work breakdown structure and adherence to documentations standards.	A	The presentation and demonstration of skill is outstanding in terms of the scholarly style, clarity, relevance and coverage of the material, knowledge and skill, formatting, referencing, grammar, sentence structure, punctuation, and word choice.	The presentation and demonstration of skill is very good in terms of the scholarly style, clarity, relevance and coverage of the material, knowledge and skill, formatting, referencing, grammar, sentence structure, punctuation, and word choice.	The presentation and demonstration of skill is good in terms of the scholarly style, clarity, relevance and coverage of the material, knowledge and skill, formatting, referencing, grammar, sentence structure, punctuation, and word choice.	The presentation and demonstration of skill is satisfactory in terms of the scholarly style, clarity, relevance and coverage of the material, knowledge and skill, formatting, referencing, grammar, sentence structure, punctuation, and word choice.	The presentation and demonstration of skill is weak and needs improvement in terms of the scholarly style, clarity, relevance and coverage of the material, knowledge and skill, formatting, referencing, grammar, sentence structure, punctuation, and word choice.	The presentation and demonstration of skill is not satisfactory in terms of the scholarly style, clarity, relevance and coverage of the material, knowledge and skill, formatting, referencing, grammar, sentence structure, punctuation,
Demonstration and Viva								
9	Clear presentation and demonstration of the submitted work	A						
10	Ability to answer questions and perform code modification	A						
AUTO AGGREGATED GRADE			A					

Grade OVERALL ASSESSMENT		Grade Counts
A	EXCELLENT Outstanding Performance: This is a very well designed and implemented solution that meets all assessment criteria	8
B	COMMENDABLE Meritorious Performance This is a very good design and implementation that broadly meets all assessment criteria	2
C	GOOD Highly Competent Performance This is a good design and implementation that meets all assessment criteria but with minor weaknesses	0
D	SATISFACTORY Competent Performance This solution meets all assessment criteria but with clear weaknesses	0
E	BORDERLINE FAIL Open to Compensation This solution does not meet one or more of the assessment criteria	0
F	FAIL Unsatisfactory This solution is technically flawed and does not meet the minimum criteria.	0

The above profile should have ten grades.

Student has provided use case diagram, activity diagram, sequesnce diagram and class diagram accurately. In the implementation, OOP concepts have been used properly. Student has mapped the design into code properly. Exception handling is done in a good way. Student has provided the accurate test plans and adhere to documentions standards in a well manner. Student has represtned a good understanding about the concepts and provided answers clearly for the questions raised during the viva. ML part was handled using API. Proper validations have been used. Student was able to explain the concepts related to encapsulation, access specifiers, interfaces, method overloading and overriding. Student was able to complete the live coding task.

The requirements for each grade are as follows.

- Grade A At least 5 components grades of A. At least 8 component grades of B or better. All 10 component grades at C or better.
- Grade B At least 5 component grades of B or better. At least 8 component grades of C or better. All 10 component grades at D or better.
- Grade C At least 5 component grades of C or better. At least 8 component grades of D or better.
- Grade D At least 5 component grades of D or better. At least 8 component grades of E or better.
- Grade E At least 8 component grades of E or better.
- Grade F The report has been submitted, but the set of component grades does not qualify for any higher grade.
- NS The report has not been submitted.

