

MODULE NAME:					MODULE CODE:	
Programming 2B					PROG6212	
Student Name:	Neville Kabamba			Total (%):		54.0%
Student Number:	ST10404539					
RUBRIC: Part 2	Levels of Achievement				Result	Feedback
	Does not meet the required standard	Meets the required standard	Partially exceeds the required standard	Greatly exceeds the required standard		
	Score Ranges Per Level (½ marks possible)					
Lecturers' Claim Submission: Implementation of Feature [20 Marks]	<b>0 - 9 Marks</b> •The feature is not implemented or does not function as expected, lacking essential functionality.	<b>10 - 14 Marks</b> • The feature is implemented but with some flaws or missing elements, impacting usability or functionality.	<b>15 - 17 Marks</b> • The feature is implemented effectively, meeting basic requirements and functioning adequately.	<b>18 - 20 Marks</b> • The feature is implemented exceptionally well, exceeding basic requirements and enhancing usability or functionality significantly.	9	More effort is required.  1. No detailed instructions provided 2. Unable to submit a claim 3. Unable to view submitted claims 4. Ensure that submitted claims can be approved or rejected 5. Implement file size and file type restrictions for uploads (e.g., max 2 MB; restrict .exe files) 6. Display appropriate error messages when uploading documents (e.g., "File size exceeds 2 MB" or "File type must be PDF, DOC, or XLSX") 7. Ensure that the uploaded
Programme Coordinators and Managers' View: Design of View [20 Marks]	<b>0 - 9 Marks</b> • The design of the view for coordinators and managers is unclear or disorganised, making it difficult to verify claims.	<b>10 - 14 Marks</b> • The design of the view is somewhat clear but lacks organisation or user-friendly features.	<b>15 - 17 Marks</b> • The design of the view is clear and organised, facilitating easy verification of claims.	<b>18 - 20 Marks</b> • The design of the view is highly intuitive and well-structured, enhancing the verification process significantly.	14	
Lecturers' Document Upload: Feature Implementation [20 Marks]	<b>0 - 9 Marks</b> • The document upload feature is missing or does not work properly, failing to allow lecturers to upload supporting documents.	<b>10 - 14 Marks</b> • The document upload feature is partially implemented or has some functionality issues.	<b>15 - 17 Marks</b> • The document upload feature is implemented effectively, allowing lecturers to upload documents with ease.	<b>18 - 20 Marks</b> • The document upload feature is implemented exceptionally well, providing a seamless experience for lecturers and ensuring secure storage of uploaded documents.	14	
Lecturers' Document Upload: Error Handling and Display [10 Marks]	<b>0 - 4 Marks</b> • Error handling is nonexistent or ineffective, leading to frequent crashes or incorrect information display.	<b>5 - 7 Marks</b> • Error handling is rudimentary, with limited effectiveness in catching and handling exceptions.	<b>8 - 9 Marks</b> • Error handling is implemented effectively, catching most exceptions and displaying meaningful error messages.	<b>10 Marks</b> • Error handling is implemented exceptionally well, ensuring the application remains stable and responsive even in the face of errors or exceptions.	5	
Claim Status Tracking: Implementation of Tracking System [10 Marks]	<b>0 - 4 Marks</b> • The tracking system for claim status is not implemented or does not update accurately, leading to inconsistencies in status representation.	<b>5 - 7 Marks</b> • The tracking system is partially implemented, with some inaccuracies or delays in status updates.	<b>8 - 9 Marks</b> • The tracking system is implemented effectively, updating claim status reasonably accurately and promptly.	<b>10 Marks</b> • The tracking system is implemented exceptionally well, providing precision and reliability and real-time and accurate updates on claim status.	4	
Consistency and Reliability: Unit Testing and Error Handling [10 Marks]	<b>0 - 4 Marks</b> • Unit testing is not conducted, or error handling mechanisms are insufficient, leading to inconsistent or unreliable application behaviour.	<b>5 - 7 Marks</b> • Unit testing is conducted to some extent, but errorhandling mechanisms are limited in effectiveness.	<b>8 - 9 Marks</b> • Unit testing is conducted effectively, covering key functionalities, and error handling mechanisms are adequate.	<b>10 Marks</b> • Unit testing is conducted comprehensively, covering all critical functionalities, and error handling mechanisms are robust, ensuring consistent and reliable application behaviour.	4	
Version Control: Commit Frequency and Descriptive Messages [10 Marks]	<b>0 - 4 Marks</b> • 2 Commits are infrequent, and commit messages lack clarity or description of changes.	<b>5 - 7 Marks</b> • 5 Commits are somewhat frequent, but commit messages may lack clarity or detail.	<b>8 - 9 Marks</b> • 7 Commits are reasonably frequent and commit messages to provide clarity and detail regarding changes.	<b>10 Marks</b> • 10 Commits are frequent, and commit messages are clear, descriptive, and informative, demonstrating excellent version control practices.	4	
Total(100):					54	