

Marking Rubrics - UECS3596 Project II

Final Report (25%)									Notes for assessor
Key assessment	Criteria	CO	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Marginal (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	
Abstract (4%)	Overview of the project	4	Not provided	Description of the project is hard to understand or misses out significant information	Overly long, or a disjointed abstract which is not by itself sufficient to describe the entire project	Summarizes the project well that enables to understand the project's scope	Clearly written description of the project which can both stand alone and provide insight into the significance of various aspects of the project	Impressive, thorough and clearly composed overview of the project which raises no questions from a reader	
Introduction (4%)	Problem identification and formulation of project aims and objectives	1	No problem identification/area, aims and objectives provided	Unclear or vague statements regarding problem area and/or aims and objectives	Problem area, aims and objectives are quite clearly stated	Problem area, aims, and objectives all well formulated	Problem area, aims, and objectives are clearly formulated and explicitly described	Problem area, aims, and objectives are perfectly formulated, analyzed and evaluated	
Literature Review (16%)	Review of research topic (4%)	4	No review, or a review which is totally off-topic	Poor review of very few sources which is off topic	Limited review with few sources or a review which is partly off topic	Sufficient review with mostly relevant and reliable sources	Adequate review with closely relevant, reliable and reputable sources.	A comprehensive review covering a large number of relevant sources which are well linked and described in relation to the project scope.	
	Analytical/Critical thinking (4%)	4	No analysis of information/data is evident or no attempt to critically discuss the literature review.	Poor analysis of sources is evident, or poor attempt to critically discuss the literature review.	Sources are quite sufficiently analyzed, or limited attempt to critically discuss the literature review.	Sources are evaluated quantitatively or qualitatively, or moderate attempt to critically discuss the literature review.	Sources are evaluated quantitatively or qualitatively, discussed in-depth or good attempt to critically discuss the literature review; highlight the current gaps in related research.	Various sources are reviewed in depth, all relevant and necessary aspects discussed and /or evaluated, or clear and good attempt to critically discuss the literature review; highlight the current gaps in related research.	
	Structure and coherence of literature review (4%)	4	No noticeable structure is evident	Poor structure; no clear relationship between sections of the review	Quite clear structure, but not all sections follow a natural or logical order	Well structured literature review where all sections are well connected.	A clear structure is obvious, which allows a reader to see relationships and transition between different sections; the review content is complete.	The structure of the review is very clear which expands a reader's deeper understanding of the topic; the content is arranged in unquestionable logical order.	
	References (4%)	5	No references provided	No relevant references provided	Limited references, with questionable quality or relevance	Sufficient number of relevant and reliable references	Large number of relevant and reputable references	Huge number of relevant, cutting edge and wide variety of reputable references	
Methodology & Project Management (8%)	Methodology of the project** (4%)	3	No description of project's methodology	Incomplete description of methodology or not aligned with the objectives.	Quite sufficient description of methodology or somewhat aligned with the objectives.	Methodology is well described providing basic information to carry out a project or aligned with the objectives.	Methodology is clearly described providing all necessary information to carry out a project or completely aligned with the objectives.	Methodology is described in very clear unquestionable manner to provide all necessary details to repeat it or completely aligned with objectives.	
	Planning and managing of project activities. (4%)	3	No evidence of project planning	Planning or resource allocation is poor and obviously insufficient	Main tasks are identified, but resource (time, cost, material etc.) allocation is insufficient	Main tasks are well identified and resources (time, cost, material etc.) allocated	All tasks are clearly identified and explained; necessary resource (time, cost, material etc.) allocation is clearly justified; all planned tasks/items are achieved timely	All tasks are clearly identified and well explained; all necessary resources (time, cost, material etc.) are allocated and clearly justified; all planned tasks/items are achieved as planned and successfully.	
Requirement specification, modelling, architecture design (18%)	Requirement specification based on analysis and/ or research (scope and boundaries, end users, user requirements, functional & non-functional requirements) 6%	1	No evidence of requirements specification	Minimal requirements specification.	Partially complete requirements specification, meeting only a few of the basic requirements.	Adequately complete requirements specification, meeting only a few of the requirements.	Detailed requirements specification, that only meeting the majority of the requirements.	Complete and detailed requirements specification, meeting all the requirements.	
	System architecture 6%	2	No system architecture provided.	Incomplete system architecture with less explanation.	Partial complete system architecture with less explanation.	Adequate complete system architecture with some explanation.	Complete system architecture with somewhat detailed explanation.	Complete system architecture with detailed explanation.	Types of architecture can be included any one of these: i) business architecture - Defines the strategy of business, governance, organization, and key business processes within an enterprise and focuses on the analysis and design of business processes. ii) application (software) architecture - serves as the blueprint for individual application systems, their interactions, and their relationships to the business processes of the organization. iii) information architecture - Defines the logical and physical data assets and data management resources. iv) IT architecture - Defines the hardware and software building blocks that make up the overall information system.
	Analysis and design modeling 6%	2	No model provided.	Models are mostly incomplete and inaccurate.	Partial complete modeling.	Adequate modeling the functions. Most of the models are less accurate.	Complete modeling all functions. Few models are less accurate.	Complete and accurate modeling in all functions.	Modeling is comprised of any relevant modeling: - requirement modeling - data and/or process and/or activity diagram (if relevant). - design modeling - sequence, component etc. (if relevant)

Key assessment	Criteria	CO	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Marginal (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	
Evaluation of solution (30%)	Development of test plan (15%)	2	No test plan provided	Test plan that only covers some of the functionalities of the developed system/ application.	Minimal test plan that covers all the functionalities of the developed system/ application.	Complete test plan that covers all the functionalities of the developed system/ application and end-user testing.	Complete test plan that covers all the functionalities of the developed system/ application and end-user testing and any 1 related type of testing (beyond specification testing) as listed.	Complete test plan that covers all the functionalities of the developed system/ application and end-user testing and any 2 related types of testing (beyond specification testing) as listed.	Plan may include testing level, testing type, designing test cases, testing environment setup. Type of testings (beyond the specification testing) may include: usability testing, compatibility testing, interface testing, services testing, low-level resource testing, performance testing, operational testing, installation testing, security testing .
	Execution of Testing of solution (15%)	2	No evidence of testing conducted.	Minimal testing show that only covers some functions (but incomplete) in the developed system/ application. Only show minimum evidences as listed.	Partial complete final testing of solution, meeting only a few of the evidences as listed.	Almost complete final testing of completed solution, meeting the majority of the evidences as listed. Most evidences show less detailed.	Complete testing of completed solution, meeting the most of the evidences as listed. Some evidences show less detailed.	Complete testing of completed solution, meeting all the evidences as listed.	Evidence that shows the following: - final testing against all elements of test plan - test result recorded in a structured way. - end-user testing
Conclusion and recommendations (8%)	Address problem statement and achievement of objectives (4%)	2	Conclusion only describes result without touching on the problems statements, aims, or objectives.	Brief conclusion that misses out either the problem statements or the stated aims and/or objectives.	Conclusion mentions and matches most part of the problem statements and stated aims and/or objectives	Conclusion mentions and matches the problem statements and stated aims and/or objectives	Conclusion summarizes clearly how the project has solved the problem and achieved stated aims and/or objectives	Conclusion emphasizes the solving the problem and achievements of stated aims and/or objectives in a concise but thorough manner.	
	Analysis of limitations and recommendations for future development (4%)	6	No mention of the potentials, limitations and recommendations for future development.	Mentions some of the potentials, limitations but leaves out some obvious ones or unrealistic recommendations for future development.	Mentions most of the potentials, limitations and some unrealistic recommendations for future development.	Mentions the potentials, obvious limitations and realistic recommendations for future development.	Describes potentials, limitations and realistic recommendations for future development in detail.	Describes potentials, provides in-depth analysis of limitations including proposals for solutions and future development recommendations which are realistic and supported by evidence	
Report Quality(6%)	Language: Grammar and style (4%)	4	Numerous grammatical or spelling errors are present which cause most part(s) of the report to be incomprehensible.	Many obvious grammatical or spelling errors are present which negatively effect understandability of the report.	Some obvious grammatical or spelling errors are present which affect understandability of the report.	Few grammatical or spelling errors can be found which does not significantly affect the report's quality.	A very few grammatical or spelling errors can be found which does not affect the report's quality.	No grammatical or spelling errors	
	Citation of various sources (4%)	5	No citation or uses material from other sources without citation	Numerous citation and/or bibliography errors	Some of the citations and bibliography are correct, with a couple of major errors	Most of the citations and bibliography are correct, with a couple of minor errors	All citations and bibliography are shown according to the guidelines with very minor inaccuracies	All citations and bibliography are shown exactly according to the guidelines, with no errors	
Feedback (4%)	Comments and feedback from FYPI (4%)	5	None of the feedbacks.	Minor feedbacks (20%) both from supervisor and moderator are take into account.	Some feedbacks (>21% to <50%) both from supervisor and moderator are take into account.	Some significant feedbacks (50%) both from supervisor and moderator are take into account to improve the report or solution.	Most feedbacks (80%) both from supervisor and moderator are take into account.	Accommodate all feedbacks both from supervisor and moderator.	
Total	100%								

Oral Presentation (15%)								
Key assessment	Criteria	CO	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Marginal (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Presentation skill (68%)	Structure and attractiveness of presentation (28%)	4	No indication of any structure	A disjointed presentation which is out of logical order	Poorly structured presentation with erratic topical shifts and jumps	Well structured presentation which enhances good understanding of the project	A clearly structured presentation which enhances understanding of the project and engages an audience	An outstanding presentation of smooth unquestionable structure and engaging content that captures audience
	Confidence (28%)	4	Presenter does not make eye contact, mumbles or presentation or is interrupted in some major way due to lack of preparation	Presenter does not make eye contact, is hard to hear, or constantly interrupts the presentation himself/herself	Poor eye contact with audience, voice not very clearly heard, some minor interruptions to the presentation	Eye contact with audience, clear-voiced presentation, no interruption to presentation	Presenter speaks with confidence in clear loud voice and captures audience's attention	Very confident presenter who speaks and holds himself/herself as a professional, completely capturing audience's attention
	Use of presentation tools and visual aids (12%)	4	No presentation tools and/or visual aids used	Very minimal use of presentation tools and/or aids, distracts audience or confuses understanding of the presentation	Presentation tools and/or aids add no value to understanding of the presentation	Presentation tools and/or aids are used appropriately	Creative presentation tools and/or aids are used that highlight the quality and audience's interest to the presentation	Novel, unusual, very creative presentation tools used which captures audience's attention and enhances understanding of the presentation
Q&A (32%)	Quality of answers provided (16%)	4	Unable to answer question(s)	Out-of-topic or evasive answers to questions	Partly appropriate answers to questions	Concise answers provided	Detailed straight to the point and yet succinct answers provided	Thorough, well elaborated and very convincing answer provided
	Attitude and composure (16%)	4	Loses composure during the Q&A session	Visibly downcast, upset, or distracted during the Q&A session	Attentive when taking and answering questions	Attentive and adequately responsive when taking and answering questions	Calm, clear and confident when taking and answering questions	Impressive composure as of a professional speaker when taking and answering questions
Total	100%							

Key assessment	Criteria	CO	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Marginal (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	
----------------	----------	----	-----------------------	---------------	-------------------	------------------	---------------	---------------	--

Technical content/ Product demonstration (45%)									
Key assessment	Criteria	CO	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Marginal (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	
Implemented solution(s) (30%)	Implemented solution(s) (30%)	2	No solution is presented	Solution fails to solve the specified problem and does not achieve any of the objectives	Solution falls short of solving the specified problem and achieved <u>some</u> objectives.	An adequate solution to a problem is proposed and achieved <u>majority of the objectives</u> .	Optimal solution to a problem is identified, verified and applied to resolve the problem successfully.	The best solution to a problem is identified, formulated and implemented successfully	
Development of solution (50%)	Implementation: Functional and non-functional requirements (50%)	2	Most of the functions are not working. Non-functional requirements do not support the intended users and/ or system functionalities.	<u>A few of the functions are partially working and are fulfilled the requirement</u> specifications and scope. Majority of the functions have shown difficulty to use or do not support the functions of the system.	<u>Most of the functions are partially working</u> and fulfilled some of the requirement specifications and scope. Most functions have shown difficulty to use and/ or no obvious of non-functional requirements delivered.	<u>Some of the functions are working</u> . Some functions are fulfilled some of the requirement specifications and scope. Some functions have shown difficulty to use and/ or little delivery of non-functional requirements.	Majority of the functions are working. Some functions are fulfilled some of the requirement specifications and scope. Difficulty to use is not obvious and/ or show some deliveries of non-functional requirements.	Full functional solution/prototype delivered. All functions are fulfilled all the requirement specifications and scope. Complete and detailed non-functional requirements that meeting all requirements and/ or support the functions of the system and provide high quality relevant attributes.	non-functionality describe how the system works that comprised of the following quality attributes: - usability - performance - security - reliability - supportability
Complexity (20%)	Complexity in project (20%)	2	None of the contents of system or HTML file is presented.	Display of contents only or a static HTML site. There is no CRUD operations involved.	Display of contents or a static HTML site, and some CRUD operations involved.	Basic operations of CRUD operations involved with good display of contents that enhanced the overall presentation of the system.	All have essential CRUD operations involved. Indicate some kind of complexity but some rooms for improvement are needed.	All have essential CRUD operations involved. Demonstrate the necessary complexity for all specifications.	Possible Criteria: - methods of storing data (simple: text file or CSV ; storage methodologies - Json, XML ; complex : relational db) - use of libraries - Sensible choice of use of libraries - programming style : demonstrate commonly used techniques in their chosen methodology, such as use of model-view-controller or AJAX for improved responsiveness. - algorithms and data structures : adapted existing data structures, - others : write code to interact with a specific hardware device, code for sharing data across LAN/ the internet among devices, combining different technologies, significant amount of research and prototyping, etc that demonstrate the required decision-making skills., incorporate data analytic or AI/machine learning

Overall effort (10%)								
Key assessment	Criteria	CO	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Marginal (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)
Communicates ideas	Written and oral communication (20%)	4	Could not understand at all.	Sometimes ideas are not delivered clearly, either in written or oral ; lack of confidence.	Able to communicate ideas clearly either in written or oral ; lack of confidence.	Generally can understand the delivery of the project information in both written and oral.	Able to communicate ideas clearly both written and oral in most of the times; sometimes lack of confidence.	Able to communicate ideas clearly both written and oral and shows confidence at all times.
systematic work	Selection and implementation of project methodology and plan (20%)	3	No planning or scheduling is evident.	Very brief plan or schedule without explicit milestones and goals, or selected plan or schedule is not realistic.	A general plan or schedule is selected, including milestones and goals.	A plan or schedule is selected, including explicit milestones and goals	A plan or schedule is selected which includes well-chosen and significant milestones and goals	A thorough plan or schedule is selected which includes well-chosen and significant milestones and goals
Ethical behaviour	Complies with FYP policies/ guidelines and ethical norms (20%)	5	Habitually late or absent, often misses deadlines, or totally lacks independence in carrying out project.	Frequent cases of absence or lateness, or overly reliant on supervisor's guidance	Scattered cases of absence or lateness, or overly reliant on supervisor's guidance.	Mostly punctual, meets most deadlines, and is reasonably independent of supervisor's instructions.	Always punctual, meets all deadlines, and demonstrates considerable independence of supervisor's instructions.	Always punctual, meets all deadlines, and takes own initiatives outside of supervisor's recommendations.
Meeting with supervisor	Discipline and regular reporting (20%)	5	Non-existing log book, never reports to supervisor or does not heed supervisor's advice.	Sparsely filled in log book, rarely reports to supervisor or not very receptive to advice.	Log book is used to keep supervisor fairly updated on progress, but student is not receptive to supervisor's advice	Log book is used appropriately to keep supervisor fairly updated on progress, and student is receptive to supervisor's advice	Log book is well compiled, student regularly updates supervisor and seeks the appropriate advice	Takes initiative to inform supervisor of progress while actively seeking supervisor's input where necessary, above and beyond the normal log book requirements
Amount of effort	Personal development / life long learning activities (20%)	6	No attempt(s) to develop personally	Limited interest in personal development, participated in at least one activity for this purpose, or honed an existing skill set for this project	sufficient interest in personal development, participated in a few activities for this purpose or improved an existing skill set for this project	Willing to develop personally and participated in some activities for this purpose or improved an existing skill set for this project	Eager to develop personally and often participated in activities for this purpose or picked up new skills for this project	Very eager to develop personally and often participated in activities or self-learning of skills for this project
Total		100%						

Poster (5%)								
Key assessment	Criteria	CO	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Marginal (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)

Key assessment	Criteria	CO	Unacceptable (0)	Poor (1)	Marginal (2)	Average (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	
Poster (100%)	Poster presentation	6	Did not submit a poster, or submitted a blank poster, or did not submit the summary of posters, or did not attend the poster competition event without the appropriate supporting documents. (Failing grade awarded)	Submitted a poster with obvious deficiencies in content, design, and/or presentation	Submitted a poster of acceptable quality with basic informational content and a readable design/presentation	Submitted a poster of good quality with fairly good amount of information regarding the project and a readable design/presentation	Submitted a poster of very good quality with a good amount of information regarding the project and is interesting to read	Submitted a poster of outstanding quality which emphasizes significant information regarding the project and an eye-catching design/presentation	
Total		100%							

To improve the grade of achievement, make sure that

- The report is free from spelling and grammatical errors (No obvious lapses in punctuation/grammar/spelling)
- The report is free from formatting and referencing errors (Report format is always consistent including heading styles, fonts, margins, blank space, captions, etc.)
- The report is well structured and written