**Network Design Proposal – Marking Rubric**

**Notes:**

* Note that the “Intent to Respond” letter and the “High-level design Presentation” (ie. the “video call”) are not listed here and are each worth 5 marks
* Wi-Fi and VLAN related bonus marks will be applied at the discretion of your Professor
* Peer evaluation results will impact the final grade of each participant, so please ensure you are valuable to your team

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Network Design Proposal Document** | | | | | | | |
|  | Excellent 75%-100% | Good 50%-75% | Satisfactory 25%-50% | Unsatisfactory 0%-25% | Points | |
| All required elements present and in a logical sequence; spelling, grammar and professionalism | Proposal contains all the elements from the template in a sensible order; document looks professional (consistent layout, fonts, etc.)    No more than two spelling/grammar errors noted | Proposal contains all the elements from the template in a sensible order; document looks professional (consistent layout, fonts, etc.)    No more than four spelling/grammar errors noted | Proposal contains most the elements from the template in a sensible order; document looks professional (consistent layout, fonts, etc.)    No more than six spelling/grammar errors noted | Proposal does not contain most of the elements from the template and/or they are in a confusing order; document looks unprofessional (inconsistent layout, fonts, etc.)    More than six spelling/grammar errors noted | /5 | |
| Network design meets the needs of the case study company and is reasonable, thoughtful, and logical | The network design submitted will address the needs of the company  All of the structured cabling  rules are consistently followed  Good hardware and cabling decisions are made | The network design submitted will address the needs of the company  Most of the structured cabling rules are consistently followed  Good hardware and cabling decisions are made | The network design submitted will address the needs of the company  Most of the structured cabling rules are consistently followed  Good hardware and cabling decisions were made | The network design submitted  will not address the needs of the company  The structured cabling rules are not followed or inconsistent  Poor hardware and cabling decisions were made | /10 | |
| Drawings clear, informative, and accurate | All drawings are easily readable  All drawings reflect the final proposed design  All drawings follow the rules outlined in the assignment | All drawings are easily readable  All drawings reflect the final proposed design  All drawings follow most of the rules outlined in the assignment | All drawings are easily readable  All drawings reflect the final proposed design  Most of the drawings follow most of the rules outlined in the assignment | Not all drawings are easily readable  Not all drawings reflect the final proposed design  Not all drawings follow the rules outlined in the assignment | /10 | |
| Costing accurate, reflects design | Equipment and cabling costs reflect all of the hardware and cabling choices in the proposal  All costs are sensible  All the costs are cited  No extraneous cost items | Equipment and cabling costs reflect all of the hardware and cabling choices in the proposal  Most costs are sensible  All the costs are cited  No extraneous cost items | Equipment and cabling costs reflect most of the hardware and cabling choices in the proposal  Most costs are sensible  All the costs are cited  No extraneous cost items | Equipment and cabling costs do not reflect the hardware and cabling choices in the proposal  Costs are not sensible  Not all the costs are cited  Extraneous cost items | /10 | |
| Total | | | | | | /35 | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Network Design Proposal Presentation** | | | | | |
|  | Excellent 75%-100% | Good 50%-75% | Satisfactory 25%-50% | Unsatisfactory 0%-25% | Points |
| All required elements present and in a logical sequence; presented with professionalism | All the elements specified in  the assignment are presented  The presentation flow is logical  The format is appropriate to  the topic and the audience  Presentation length requirements are met | All the elements specified in the assignment are presented  The presentation flow is logical  The format is mostly appropriate to the topic and the audience  Presentation length  requirements are mostly met | Most of the elements specified  in the assignment are presented  The presentation flow is logical  The format is mostly appropriate to the topic and the audience  Presentation length  requirements are mostly met | Not all the elements specified in the assignment are presented  Presentation flow is not logical  The format is inappropriate to the topic and the audience  Presentation length requirements are not met | /6 |
| Proposal is clearly explained | The details of the proposal are presented well  Information presented in a  clear and unambiguous way  by all of the participants | The details of the proposal are presented well  Information presented in a clear and unambiguous way by most  of the participants | Most of the details of the  proposal are presented well  Information presented in a clear and unambiguous way by most  of the participants | The details of the proposal are not well presented  Information presented in an unclear/confusing way by the participants | /6 |
| Shows creativity | Presentation shows enthusiasm of team  A consistent effort is made to make the presentation interesting  to watch | | Presentation shows enthusiasm of at least some of the team  Some effort is made to make the presentation interesting to watch | Presentation does not shows enthusiasm of team  Little effort is made to make the presentation interesting to watch | /3 |
| Total | | | | | /15 |
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