

ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT REPORT RUBRIC				
CRITERIA	1 – 2 SIMPLISTIC	3 – 4 ACCEPTABLE	5 – 6 GOOD	7 – 8 EXCELLENT
<b>System's Overview (15 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not informative and not understandable.</li> <li>Does not demonstrate an understanding of the project.</li> <li>Poor project description.</li> <li>Description of weaknesses or improvements is incomplete and poorly understood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not very informative or understandable.</li> <li>Demonstrates somewhat understanding of the project.</li> <li>Limited or poor project description.</li> <li>Description of weaknesses or improvements is half complete and moderately understood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Somewhat informative and understandable.</li> <li>Demonstrates fairly understanding of the project.</li> <li>Adequate project description.</li> <li>Description of weaknesses or improvements is almost complete and well understood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly informative and understandable.</li> <li>Demonstrates full understanding of the project.</li> <li>Complete project description.</li> <li>Description of weaknesses or improvements is fully complete and well understood.</li> </ul>
<b>Conceptual ERD (10 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNABLE to show understanding of the basic concepts of ERD.</li> <li>Populated the tables with MINIMAL data elements as outlined in the ERD design - with NUMEROUS errors.</li> <li>WRONG the use of names, definition in entities and attributes. Shows NO understanding in identifying the tables based on the case study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exhibit MINIMAL understanding of the basic concepts in ERD.</li> <li>Populated the tables with MINIMAL data elements as outlined in the ERD design - with MINIMAL errors.</li> <li>INACCURATE the use of names, definition in entities and attributes - table name DID NOT correlate with its data elements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exhibit PARTIAL understanding of the basic concepts in ERD.</li> <li>Populated the tables with MAJORITY data elements as outlined in the ERD design - with MINIMAL errors.</li> <li>Some MINOR inaccurate use of names, definition in entities and attributes - MOST table name is not clear in regard of its data elements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COMPLETE understand the basic concepts in ERD.</li> <li>A COMPLETE populated the tables with CORRECT data elements as outlined in the ERD design.</li> <li>Completely and accurately use of names, definition in entities and attributes - table name is appropriately used in regard of its data elements.</li> </ul>

<b>Logical ERD and Relational Database Schemas (20 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are major errors in the logical ERD and data dictionary.</li> <li>• Populated the tables with MINIMAL data elements as outlined in the ERD design - with NUMEROUS errors.</li> <li>• Relations derived mostly incorrect and incomplete.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are substantial errors in the logical ERD and data dictionary.</li> <li>• Populated the tables with MINIMAL data elements as outlined in the ERD design - with MINIMAL errors.</li> <li>• Relations derived half incorrect and incomplete.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are minor errors in the logical ERD and data dictionary.</li> <li>• Populated the tables with MAJORITY data elements as outlined in the ERD design - with MINIMAL errors.</li> <li>• Relations derived almost correct and complete.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logical ERD and data dictionary are complete and correct.</li> <li>• A COMPLETE populated the tables with CORRECT data elements as outlined in the ERD design.</li> <li>• Relations derived correctly and complete.</li> </ul>
<b>Normalization (10 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNABLE to differentiate the dependencies and normal-form levels.</li> <li>• LITTLE evidence that shows the understanding of normalization steps.</li> <li>• There are major errors in the illustrated normalization process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exhibit MINIMAL understanding of the dependencies and normalform levels.</li> <li>• Shows MINIMAL understanding of normalization steps.</li> <li>• There are substantial errors in the illustrated normalization process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exhibit PARTIAL understanding of the dependencies and normalform levels.</li> <li>• Shows GOOD understanding of normalization steps, but still have MINOR details on the concept.</li> <li>• There are minor errors in the illustrated normalization process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COMPLETE understanding of the dependencies and normal-form levels.</li> <li>• Shows COMPLETE understanding of normalization steps.</li> <li>• The normalization process for all relations is illustrated correctly.</li> </ul>
<b>SQL Implementation (20 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal tables are created with complete create table SQL statements with all PKs and FKs are defined correctly.</li> <li>• Most SQL statements developed are irrelevant and cannot be retrieved.</li> <li>• Appropriate queries that include less than 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About half of tables created with complete create table SQL statements with all PKs and FKs are defined correctly.</li> <li>• About half SQL statements developed are irrelevant and cannot be retrieved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Almost all tables are created with complete create table SQL statements with all PKs and FKs are defined correctly.</li> <li>• Some SQL statements developed are relevant and can be retrieved.</li> <li>• Appropriate queries that include 4 to 5 queries and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All tables are created with complete create table SQL statements with all PKs and FKs are defined correctly.</li> <li>• All SQL statements developed are relevant and can be retrieved.</li> <li>• Appropriate queries that include 4 to 5 queries and</li> </ul>

	queries and no JOIN queries available.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate queries that include 3 to 4 queries and only 1 to 2 JOIN queries available.</li> </ul>	only 1 to 2 JOIN queries available.	at least 3 queries available.
<b>Interface Design (10 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Almost all interfaces produced incorrect output.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some interfaces produced incorrect output.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At most 2 interfaces produced or displayed incorrect output.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interfaces produced or displayed fully correct output.</li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion (5 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No discussion on achievement, limitation, or contribution.</li> <li>No suggestions for future works.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited/minimal discussion on achievement, limitation, or contribution.</li> <li>Limited/minimal suggestions for future works.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Somewhat clear discussion on achievement, limitation, or contribution.</li> <li>Insufficient or irrelevant suggestions for future works</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear discussion on achievement, limitation, or contribution.</li> <li>Relevant suggestions for future works</li> </ul>
<b>Reflection: Description - Pure Facts (2 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the description of learning experience is irrelevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Author makes an attempt to demonstrate description of the learning experience but unclear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The learning experience being reflected is relevant but less meaningful.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The learning experience being reflected upon is significant and meaningful.</li> </ul>
<b>Reflection: Description – Feelings (2 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little or no recognition or attention to emotions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition but no exploration or attention to emotions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition, exploration, and attention to emotions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition, exploration, attention to emotions, and gain of emotional insight.</li> </ul>
<b>Reflection: Evaluation (2 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No description of experiences in designing database including the disorienting dilemma, conflict, challenge, or issue of concern.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak description of experiences in designing database including of the disorienting dilemma, conflict, challenge, or issue of concern.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate description of experiences in designing database system including of the disorienting dilemma, conflict, challenge, or issue of concern.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justifying full experience in designing database system including the disorienting dilemma, conflict, challenge, or issue of concern that includes multiple perspectives, exploring alternative explanations, and challenging assumptions.</li> </ul>

<b>Reflection: Analysis (2 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No analysis to resolve problems in database planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack analysis to resolve problems in database planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate analysis to resolve problems in database planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive analysis to resolve problems in database planning.</li> </ul>
<b>Reflection: Self-criticism (2 Marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is attempt at self-criticism, but reflection fails to demonstrate a new awareness of personal biases.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reflection demonstrates ability to question own biases but new modes of thinking not evident.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reflection demonstrates ability to question own biases, stereotypes, preconceptions, and/or assumptions and fairly define new modes of thinking as a result.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reflection demonstrates ability to question own biases, stereotypes, preconceptions, and/or assumptions and define new modes of thinking as a result.</li> </ul>