|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2/1 |
| **Overall Functionality**  **(40 marks)**  **Application performance and Robustness – including the balance between client and server queries.**  **(15 = 7 + 8 marks)**  **Application UI Design. Note that there is no direct assessment of the quality of the graphic design – this is purely based on function and usability.**  **(15 marks)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 7 level grade, and is thoroughly professional in its implementation and performance.  The application presents data quickly and without any noticeable latency as queries are processed. Filtering is complementary to the API endpoints.  The application is robust, without any noticeable errors and handles service failures and errors gracefully.  The application is clean and uncluttered, and the principal use cases are a natural fit for the user interface, allowing execution without undue effort or confusion. Menus and other control structures are well thought out and the user has little trouble navigating the site. | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 6 level grade in the specification. This includes a React site catering to each of the API endpoints and ***at least one of*** the graph and mapping components.  The application is robust and executes without noticeable error and handles gracefully most service failures.  The application is clean and generally uncluttered, and the principal use cases are readily executed, though there may be some clumsiness in the workflow. | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 5 level grade in the specification. This includes a React site catering to each of the API endpoints .  The application is robust and executes with only occasional errors and handles gracefully most service failures.  The application is clean and generally uncluttered, and the principal use cases are reasonably easily executed, though there are some questionable choices in the design. | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 4 level grade in the specification. This includes an html-based site catering to each of the API endpoints .  The application basically works, but the robustness is questionable and there are obvious errors and service failures are not handled well.  The application is somewhat clean and uncluttered, but overall the design is clumsy and doesn’t operate very well. | The client side application implements some of the functionality listed as necessary for a 4 level grade, but does not consume all of the services or some are poorly implemented.  The application basically works, but there are numerous errors and failures.  The application is poorly laid out, but the basic functionality remains usable. | The application does not meet the specification or is fundamentally flawed in its use of the API and its services.  The application is markedly incomplete and results in numerous errors.  Layout is poor and usability very weak. | | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 6 level grade, and is mostly professional in its implementation and performance. Some high level features may have minor issues or limitations.  The application presents data quickly as queries are processed, though occasional latency may be observed. Filtering is generally complementary to the API endpoints.  The application is robust and executes without noticeable errors and handles gracefully most service failures.  The application is clean and generally uncluttered, and the principal use cases are readily executed, though there may be some clumsiness in the workflow. Menus and other control structures are well thought out and the user generally has little trouble navigating the site. | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 5 level grade. These are implemented professionally. Some 6/7 level features may be attempted but these are not implemented to the standard required for the next grade level.  The application presents data reasonably quickly as queries are processed. However, there may be some noticeable latency or an inappropriate division between client and server processing.  The application is robust and  executes with only occasional errors and handles gracefully most service failures.  The application is clean and generally uncluttered, and the principal use cases are reasonably easily executed, though there are some questionable choices in the design. Menus and other control structures are reasonably well thought out, but there may be some issue. Navigation may not always be straightforward. | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 4 level grade in the specification. These are implemented to a good standard, but there may be some minor issues.  The application just uses the API endpoints or there are significant performance issues.  The application basically works, but the robustness is questionable and there are obvious errors and service failures are not handled well.  The application is somewhat clean and uncluttered, but overall the design is clumsy and doesn’t operate very well. Menus and other control structures are basically sensible but there may be poor choices. Navigation may present some problems. . | The client side application implements some of the functionality listed as necessary for a 4 level grade, but does not consume all of the services or some are poorly implemented.  The application doesn’t hit all the endpoints.  The application basically works, but there are numerous errors and failures.  The application is poorly laid out, but the basic functionality remains usable. Navigation is difficult. | The application does not meet the specification or is fundamentally flawed in its use of the API and its services.  The application is markedly incomplete and performance is poor.  The application is markedly incomplete and results in numerous errors.  Layout is poor and usability very weak. The site is barely usable. |
| **Marks (70)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Development and Code Quality**  **(10 marks)** | The application shows clear evidence of a professional approach to development, with a coherent modular structure and code quality at a near professional level. | The application shows good evidence of a professional approach to development, with a coherent modular structure and code quality at a near professional level, apart from some minor variations. | The application shows some evidence of a professional approach to development, with a reasonably coherent modular structure and competent, but not always professional level code quality. | The application shows limited evidence of a professional approach to development, with ad hoc or unclear organisation of the application and variable levels of code quality. | Application development has been ad hoc and little more than hacking, with no obvious organisation. Code exhibits numerous defects when compared to the standard expected. | Application development is deeply flawed, with little structure and poor code quality. |
| **Report and Reflections.**  **(20 marks = 8 + 6 + 6)** | The report is thoroughly professional and addresses each of the listed requirements in detail and with only occasional errors of grammar or structure.  The reflection on the UI demonstrates a near-professional critical analysis of the design choices and the resulting usability. The submission addresses each of the points listed or provides an equivalent framework for discussion and comparison.  The reflection on accessibility demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the issues and their application in this environment, clearly examining the limitations of the application. The submission addresses each of the points listed or provides an equivalent framework for discussion and comparison | The report is thoroughly professional and addresses each of the listed requirements in detail and with some more frequent errors in grammar or structure.  The reflection on the UI demonstrates a very good critical analysis of the design choices and the resulting usability, but the discussion may not address the full range of concerns or do so superficially in a small number of cases.  The reflection on accessibility demonstrates a very good understanding of the issues and their application in this environment, highlighting the examining the limitations of the application, but the discussion may not address the full range of concerns or do so superficially in a small number of cases. | The report is professional but lacks some detail in a small number of the listed requirements. There may be occasional errors of grammar or structure.  The reflection on the UI demonstrates a good critical analysis of the design choices and the resulting usability, but some of the discussion may appear superficial or unconvincing in a number of cases.  The reflection on accessibility demonstrates a good understanding of the issues and their application in this environment, highlighting the examining the limitations of the application but some of the discussion may appear superficial or unconvincing in a number of cases. | The report is adequate, but the coverage is deficient in a number of the listed requirements. Grammar and structure may be somewhat variable, but are overall ok.  The reflection on the UI demonstrates a good critical analysis of the design choices and usability in some respects, but much of the discussion is superficial or unconvincing or lacks an appropriate framework.  The reflection demonstrates a good critical analysis of the accessibility issues and their application in some respects, but much of the discussion is superficial or unconvincing or lacks an appropriate framework. | The report is somewhat adequate, but the coverage is deficient in many of the listed requirements. Grammar and structure are of variable quality.  The reflection is superficial and unconvincing and lacks a coherent organising framework. There is little or no critical analysis of the application and the choices made.    The reflection is superficial and unconvincing and lacks a coherent organising framework. There is little or no critical analysis of the application and the choices made. | The report is flawed and doesn’t meet the requirements. There may be whole sections missing or poorly covered. There is no coherent professional report structure as required  The reflection is deeply flawed or has not been attempted.  The reflection is deeply flawed or has not been attempted. |
| **Marks (30)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall Marks (100)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |