### Module Specific Rubric for KV6002 Demonstration Assessment

### 1 Implementation of individual specified subsystem (20 individual marks)

Comprehensiveness of implementation of the prototyped **functions** specified in the requirements specification derived in previous phase, including any enhancements based on feedback received for your terms of reference.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range** | **Description of Quality** |
| 18-20 | An exceptional prototype. Expectations have been exceeded. Difficult to fault. |
| 16-17 | An outstanding prototype. Expectations have been exceeded. There are omissions, errors or oversights but these are very minor. |
| 14-15 | An excellent prototype. Expectations have been exceeded. There are omissions, errors or oversights but these are minor. |
| 12-13 | This is a good to very good prototype. There are issues either with the completeness of the implementation or its fluency (e.g., a bit basic). |
| 10-11 | Satisfactory prototype. Addresses a reasonable set of stakeholder stories. This has been achieved with a reasonable degree of fluency. Overall satisfactory. |
| 8-9 | This is a just about satisfactory implementation. There are likely to be issues of completeness of fluency or both. It may be only a basic solution has been provided. It may be several of the stories have not been addressed. Or a combination of these. However, these is still a working system which demonstrates a solution to more than one of the stories. Overall weak but satisfactory. |
| 6-7 | Either a single stakeholder story has not been addressed or have not been correctly implemented. A clear attempt has been made. |
| 1-5 | Overall, a very unsatisfactory system. A very limited attempt to address the question. |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |

### 2. Quality and Robustness of Subsystem (20 individual marks)

Error handling, user validation and robustness of subsystem functions; this should be demonstrated across the scope of the individual component. To obtain full marks you must have provided a fluent implementation of the full scope of your element.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range** | **Description of Quality** |
| 18-20 | The system ran without error. All user input is validated, and all exceptional cases are trapped. All reasonable exceptional user actions are dealt with appropriately. The full scope of the individual component is implemented with a high degree of fluency. All non-functional requirements (including security and HCI (if relevant)) have been considered and dealt with appropriately. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault. |
| 16-17 | The system ran without error. All user input is validated, and all exceptional cases are trapped. All reasonable exceptional user actions are dealt with appropriately. The full scope of the individual component is implemented with a high degree of fluency. Non-functional requirements (including security and HCI (if relevant)) have been considered and dealt with appropriately. There are very minor omissions, errors, or oversights. Overall outstanding. |
| 14-15 | The system ran without error. All user input is validated, and all exceptional cases are trapped. All reasonable exceptional user actions are dealt with appropriately. The full scope of the individual component is implemented with a high degree of fluency. Non-functional requirements (including security and HCI (if relevant)) have been considered and dealt with appropriately. There are minor omissions, errors or oversights. Overall excellent. |
| 12-13 | The system displayed few errors in response to exceptional cases or user input, but all significant functions can be completed. Errors are minor. Most of the individual component implemented competently. Good consideration of non-functional requirements (including security and HCI (if relevant)). Overall good to very good. |
| 10-11 | The system displayed errors in response to exceptional cases or user input, but all significant functions can be completed. The core elements of the individual component may be implemented competently (including any non-functional requirements); there may be issues with less high priority elements. Overall satisfactory. |
| 8-9 | The system displayed errors in response to exceptional or normal cases that prevented some significant functions from being completed. A significant attempt has been made at implementing the core elements of this component (including any non-functional requirements). Overall weak but satisfactory. |
| 6-7 | The system showed errors, either in normal or exceptional cases, which prevented any significant functions or non-functional requirements from being completed. Overall unsatisfactory. |
| 1-5 | Overall, very unsatisfactory. A very limited attempt to address the question. Something is demonstrable. |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |

### 3. Feedback from Stakeholders (20 individual marks)

This will be a single word or pdf document entitled README which shall explain the processed used to obtain this feedback, provide a summary of the feedback itself and have the feedback in the appendix.

The processes used to obtain feedback were:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range** | **Description of Quality** |
| 9-10 | Difficult to fault. The processes used where extremely comprehensive and well designed. |
| 8 | Outstanding. The processes used where comprehensive and well designed. Any issues are very minor. |
| 7 | Excellent. The processes used where comprehensive and well designed. Any issues are minor. |
| 6 | Good. The processes used where appropriate. However, improvements were possible. |
| 5 | Satisfactory. The processes used where in the main appropriate. However, could easily have been improved. |
| 4 | Weak but satisfactory. The processes could result in feedback in a limited manner could be gained from stakeholders. |
| 3 | Unsatisfactory. Not a good approach. Likely to have major flaws or not be very clear. |
| 1-2 | Attempted but very poor. |
| 0 | No meaningful attempt. |

The stakeholders indicate the system was. The maximum mark you can get for this part is the mark you obtained for the first part.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range** | **Description of Quality** |
| 9-10 | Difficult to fault. |
| 8 | Outstanding. Any issues are very minor |
| 7 | Excellent. Any issues are minor |
| 6 | Good. However, improvements were possible. |
| 5 | Satisfactory. However, could easily have been improved. |
| 4 | Weak but satisfactory. |
| 3 | Unsatisfactory. |
| 1-2 | Attempted but very poor. |
| 0 | No meaningful attempt. |

### 3. Demonstration structure, understanding & responses to questions (20 individual marks)

Structure and clarity of demonstration; understanding of the work done; quality of responses to questions about the prototype. We expect you to demonstrate professionalism by being punctual, using appropriate language and respect for your audience and team members and measured responses to questions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marks** | **Description of quality** |
| 18-20 | Clear and concise responses and explanations provided: a thorough demonstration of the individual area of responsibility. Highly professional throughout. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault. |
| 16-17 | Clear and concise responses and explanations provided: a thorough demonstration of the individual area of responsibility. Highly professional throughout. Any criticism / suggestions for improvement are very minor. Overall outstanding. |
| 14-15 | Clear and concise responses and explanations provided: a thorough demonstration of the individual area of responsibility. Highly professional throughout. Any criticism / suggestions for improvement are minor. Overall excellent. |
| 12-13 | Good to very good responses and explanations provided most of the time, though at times showed a minor lack of knowledge and/or insight about the individual area of responsibility. Professional throughout |
| 10-11 | Satisfactory to good responses and explanations provided the majority of the time, though at times showed lack of knowledge and insight about the individual area of responsibility. Professional throughout. |
| 8-9 | Weak but satisfactory responses and explanations provided some of the time, though showed lack of knowledge and insight about the individual area of responsibility. Minor lapses in professionalism |
| 6-7 | Poor responses and demonstration of the prototype, showing little confidence, insight and/or knowledge about the individual area of responsibility. Could be lacking in professionalism in a minor manner. |
| 1-5 | Very poor responses and demonstration of the prototype, showing little confidence, insight and/or knowledge about the individual area of responsibility. Could be lacking in professionalism in a minor manner |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. Or could be major lapses in professionalism (turning up very late (in the middle of the demo maybe), swearing, talking very loudly whilst the group is presenting, rudeness, etc) |

### 4. Quality and Consistency of System Integration (20 group marks)

Comprehensiveness of system integration and consistency of the whole system. You will not be penalised for incomplete individual sub-components. Additionally, if there are group issues, please inform the module team at the earliest opportunity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Range** | **Description of Quality** |
| 18-20 | The system has been integrated to a high standard and any user interface follows a consistent standard throughout. Common functionality is implemented to an extremely high standard. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault. |
| 16-17 | The system has been integrated to a high standard and any user interface follows a consistent standard throughout. Common functionality is implemented to an extremely high standard. Any divergence from this standard is very minor and does not interfere with the overall usability of the system. Overall outstanding. |
| 14-20 | The system has been integrated to a high standard and any user interface follows a consistent standard throughout. Common functionality is implemented to an extremely high standard. Any divergence from this standard is minor and does not interfere with the overall usability of the system. Overall excellent. |
| 12-13 | The system has been well integrated and is largely consistent. Common functionality is clear easy to use and is generally to a very high standard. Overall good to very good. |
| 10-11 | The system has been fairly well integrated. Common functionality has been implemented to a satisfactory standard but could lead to some confusion for novice users. Overall satisfactory. |
| 8-9 | Some evidence of an integrated system and a consistent and appropriate interface standard, though with several omissions and inconsistencies. |
| 6-7 | Limited evidence of integration. For example, very little evidence of a consistent interface standard or many of the sub-systems must be demonstrated separately. Something is demonstrable e.g., at least two subcomponents have been integrated. Overall unsatisfactory. |
| 1-5 | Overall, very poor. There is very limited evidence of an attempt to integrate the system. Something is demonstrable e.g., at least two aspects have been integrated in some manner |
| 0 | Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. |