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**Declaration**

**We confirm that we have read and shall comply with all the terms and conditions of TAR University College’s plagiarism policy.**

**We declare that this assignment is free from all forms of plagiarism and for all intents and purposes is my own properly derived work.**

**Team Members:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Assessment Criteria (Part 2)** | | | | | | | Presentation 4% | Total | Comments |
| Student Name | Signature | SC  4% | DID  8% | FCD  4% | PD  4% | DD  4% | TW  4% | PM  4% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SC - State chart diagram

DID - Design interaction diagrams

FCD - Final class diagram

PD - Package diagram

DD- Deployment Diagram

TW - Team Work

PM - Project management

**BACS2053 Object-Oriented Analysis and Design (Assessment Rubrics for Part 2(36%)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tutorial Group : (Programme: RSD2 May16) Grade: \_\_\_\_  Student’s Name: |  | Grade: \_\_\_\_ |
|  |  |

**RUBRICS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **State**  **chart diagram** | **Design interaction diagrams** | **Final class diagram** | **Package diagram** | **Deployment Diagram** | **Team Work** | **Project management** | **Presentation** |
| **Marks** | **(4)** | **(8)** | **(4)** | **(4)** | **(4)** | **(4)** | **(4)** | **(4)** |
| **Poor** | The state chart diagrams are *incomplete* and *illogical*.  (0-1m) | The interaction diagrams are *incomplete* and *illogical*.  (0-2m) | The final class diagram is *incomplete* and *illogical*.  (0-1m) | Major error(s) in package diagram.  (0-1m) | Major error(s) in deployment diagram.  (0-1m) | Contribute very minimal ideas during meeting  (0-1) | Achieved >= 50% of required weekly deliverables submission for the entire case study.  (0-1m) | Reading from presentation material.  Presentation material is well prepared.  Presentation sequence not well organized and not smooth  (0-1m) |
| **Average** | The state chart diagrams are *complete* with *no major errors*.  But contains flaws or omissions.  (2m) | The diagrams are *completewith events carried out by boundary, control and entity objects*; *balanced mix of sequence & collaboration diagram*;  But contains flaws or omissions. (3-4m) | The final class diagram is *complete* with appropriate data types, class operations & class associations.  (2m) | Minor error(s) and complete in package diagram.  (2m) | Minor error(s) and complete in deployment diagram.  (2m) | Contribute some ideas during meeting  (2m) | Achieved >= 60% of required weekly deliverables submission for the entire case study.  (2m) | Reading occasionally from presentation material.  Presentation material is well prepared.  Presentation sequence acceptably organized and smooth  (2m) |
| **Good** | The above +  With *labeling* and *no mistakes in logic and notation*.  (3m) | The above +  With *labeling* and *no mistakes in logic and notation*.  (5-6m) | The above +  With appropriate multiplicities & generalization.  (3m) | Almost error-free and complete in package diagram.  With *labeling* and *no mistakes in logic and notation*.  (3m) | Almost error-free and complete in deployment diagram.  With *labeling* and *no mistakes in logic and notation*. (3m) | Active in contribution of ideas during meeting.  (3m) | Achieved >= 70% of required weekly deliverables submission for the entire case study.  (3m) | Good oral presentation, Presentation material is well prepared.  Presentation sequence well organized and smooth  (3m) |
| **Excellent** | The above +  With *very good and meaningful labeling* according to guidelines.  (4m) | The above +  With *very good and meaningful labeling* according to guidelines.  (7-8m) | The above +  With *no major errors* in notation.  (4m) | The above +  With *very good and meaningful labeling* according to guidelines.  (4m) | The above +  With *very good and meaningful labeling* according to guidelines.  (4m) | Very active in contribution of ideas during meeting.  (4m) | Achieved >= 80% of required weekly deliverables submission for the entire case study.  (4m) | Give an impactful presentation where the presenter delivers smooth oral presentation aided beautifully by well-prepared presentation material. Presentation sequence excellently planned, organized and smooth  (4m) |
| **Comments** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |