ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

CRITERIA	MARKS					Comments
	16-20	13-15	10-12	8-9	0-7	
User Interface Design (35%)	Excellent in the areas of the scope. All areas are at least good. May be outstanding is some areas and good in others and hence is on balance excellent. Good or above in all areas. Likely to contain minor errors, omissions or additions which prevent the user interface design from being outstanding. Overall an excellent user interface design.	Good in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the user interface design is outstanding or excellent in some areas and satisfactory in others but on balance is good. Satisfactory or above in all areas. Likely to contain a small number of errors, omissions or additions which prevent the user interface design from being excellent. Overall a good user interface design.	Satisfactory in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the user interface design is good or above in some areas and satisfactory in others. Weak in no more than two areas. Likely to contain a number of errors, omissions or additions which prevent the user interface design from being good. Overall satisfactory.	Weak in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the user interface design is satisfactory or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others. Likely to be weak in more than three areas. It might be unsatisfactory in one area but no more. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings which prevent the user interface design from being satisfactory. Overall poor.	Unsatisfactory diagram in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the user interface design is weak or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others. Unsatisfactory in two or more areas. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings which prevent the user manual from being weak. May not be recognisable as a user interface design, might have majors errors in content or a combination of the two.	
	16-20	13-15	10-12	8-9	0-7	
Implementation (35%)	Excellent in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency, and syntax.	Good in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency, and syntax.	Satisfactory in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency, and syntax.	Weak in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency, and syntax.	Unsatisfactory in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency, and syntax.	

	The application shows particular insight or originality in its approach. Excellent functionalities which identify the underlying principles behind the problem. All areas are at least good. It may be outstanding in some areas and good in others, on balance. Good or above in all areas. Likely to contain minor errors, omissions, and additions that prevent the implementation from being outstanding. Overall perfect performance.	The application may be outstanding or excellent in some areas and satisfactory in others, but good on balanced. Satisfactory or above in all areas. Likely to contain a small number of errors, omissions,s or additions which prevent the implementation from being excellent. Overall an exemplary implementation.	The application may be good or above in some areas and acceptable in others. Likely to be weak in no more than two areas. Likely to contain several errors, omissions, or additions which prevent the implementation from being good. Overall a satisfactory implementation.	The application may be satisfactory or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others. Likely to be weak in more than three areas. It might be unsatisfactory deficient no more. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings which prevent the implementation from being satisfactory. Still recognizable as an application of the problem in focus. Overall poor but satisfactory.	The application may be weak or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others. Deficient in two or more areas. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings which prevent the implementation from being weak. It may not be recognizable as an application and might have major errors in implementation or a combination of the two.	

Report (30%)	**16-20**	**13-15**	**10-12**	**8-9**	**0-7**	
	Discussing how it meets specified requirements shows excellent insight into the issues involved and alternatives available. The discussion clearly and concisely demonstrates a deep understanding of the	Good in the discussion of the results. The explanation and justification of meeting specified requirements show a good understanding of the issues involved and the available alternatives.	Satisfactory in the discussion of the results. The explanation and justification of how it meets specified requirements cover the relevant issues involved and alternatives available, but it is	Weak in the areas of the discussion of the results. The explanation and justification of how it meets specified requirements are inadequate. The discussion may be satisfactory or above in some	Unsatisfactory in the areas of the discussion of the results. It conveys little understanding of the problem's solution or no proper explanation and justification of how it meets specified requirements.	

	16-20	13-15	10-12	8-9	0-7	Comments
	project implementation. Maybe great in some areas and good in others and, hence, excellent balance. Good or above in all areas. Likely to contain minor errors, omissions, or additions which prevent the discussion of the results from being outstanding. Overall an excellent results discussion.	The discussion demonstrates a good deal of the project implementation. The discussion may be outstanding or excellent in some areas and satisfactory in others but on balance is good. Satisfactory or above in all areas. Likely to contain a small number of errors, omissions, or additions which prevent the discussion of the results from being excellent. Overall a good results discussion.	not in great respect. The discussion may be above in some areas and satisfactory in others. Likely to be weak in no more than two areas. Likely to contain several errors and omissions that prevent the discussion of the results from discussing satisfactory results.	areas and unsatisfactory in others. Likely to be weak in more than three areas. It might be deficient in one area but no more. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings which prevent the discussion of the results from being satisfactory. Overall poor but satisfactory.	The discussion may be weak or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others. Deficient in two or more areas. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings, which prevent the discussion of the results from being weak.	

Presentation (50%)	**16-20**	**13-15**	**10-12**	**8-9**	**0-7**	**Comments**
	Excellent, well-directed presentation, logically and coherently structured. It is free or almost free of grammatical errors.	Good presentation, logically structured. There are occasional spelling and grammatical errors, but the reader does not struggle to interpret the writer's intended meaning.	Satisfactory presentation, well structured. It contains several spelling and grammatical errors, but the reader does not struggle to interpret the writer's intended meaning. It is	Weak presentation and structure. Spelling and grammatical errors force the reader to struggle to determine the intended meaning. Organizational tools such as headings and paragraphs are	Unsatisfactory presentation and structure. Numerous spelling and grammatical errors and a lack of clear, consistent organization interfere with the writer's ability to communicate the key points.	

| The format is straightforward and consistent with appropriate headings and paragraphs.

English usage is easily understandable.

References and quotations are utilized appropriately to indicate sources.

Excellent in the presentation and handling all questions.

Explaining how it meets specified requirements shows outstanding insight showthgreatvolved and alternatives available.
The clearly and concisely demonstrates a deep understanding of the project implementation.

Maybe significant in some areas, and good in others and hence is excellent.
Good or above in all areas. | The writing would benefit from using organizational tools (e.g., headings, paragraphs) and more consistent use of references to sources.

Good in the presentation and handling all questions with some minor inaccurate answers.

The explanation and justification of meeting specified requirements show a good understanding of the issues involved and the available alternatives.

The presentation demonstrates a good deal of the project implementation.

The presentation may be excellent in some areas and satisfactory in others but on balance is good.

Satisfactory or above in all areas. | possible that organizational tools (e.g., headings and paragraphs) are good or above in some areas and satisfactory in others.

Satisfactory in the presentation and handling most of the questions with some inaccurate answers.

The explanation and justification of how it meets specified requirements cover relevant aspects of the issues involved and alternatives available, but it is not outstanding.
The presentation may be good or above in some areas and satisfactory in others.

Likely to be weak in no more than two areas.

Likely to contain several errors, omissions, or additions which | used inconsistently. References are not appropriately utilized to indicate the sources of material.

Weak in the presentation areas and handling some of the questions, but most answers are inaccurate—the explanation and justification of how it meets specified requirements are inadequate.

The explanation may be satisfactory or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others.

Likely to be weak in more than three areas. It might be deficient in one area but no more.

Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings which prevent the presentation from being satisfactory. | The reader frequently cannot determine the intended meaning.

There are no references to indicate material taken from other sources.

Unsatisfactory in the presentation areas and handling all questions and not able to answer any questions posed.

It conveys little understanding of the solution n of the problem or no proper explanation and justification of how it meets specified requirements.

The presentation may be weak or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others.

Deficient in two or more areas. Likely to contain errors, omissions, | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Likely to contain minor errors and omissions or additions which prevent the presentation from being outstanding.

Overall an excellent presentation. | Likely to contain a small number of errors, omissions,s or additions which prevent the presentation from being excellent.

Overall a good presentation. | prevent the presentation from being good.

Overall a satisfactory presentation. | Overall poor but satisfactory. | additions, or misunderstandings which prevent the presentation from being weak. | |