

Appendix 2 – Assessment Rubric (Part B) 60% – CLO1

Name(s):

Programme:

Group:

Date:

Program (60%)

No	Item	Criteria			Final Marks
		Poor	Accomplished	Good	
1	Output (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate information/ outputs needed are generated. Most of the information/ outputs generated are less accurate. Results visualization is overly cluttered or the design seems inappropriate for the problem area. Lack of information that are useful for the user 0 - 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate information/ outputs needed are generated. The information/ output generated are accurate but some with errors. Pleasant looking, clean, well-organized results visualization The information displayed is useful for the user, but some details are omitted. 5 - 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the necessary information/ outputs are generated. All or most of the information/ outputs generated are accurate. Minor errors can be ignored. The results are visually pleasing and appealing. Great use of colors, fonts, graphics and layout. The information displayed is useful to the users and complete with necessary details. 8 - 10	
2	Programming (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The end product fails with many logic errors, many actions lacked exception handling. Solutions are over-simplified. Programming skills need improvement. 0 - 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major parts are logical, but some steps to complete a specific job may be tedious or unnecessarily complicated. Program algorithm demonstrates an acceptable level of complexity. The student is qualified to be a programmer 5 - 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct and logical flow, exceptions are handled well. Demonstrates appropriate or high level of complex algorithms and programming skills. 8 - 10	
3	Degree of completion (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too much still remains to be done. Basic requirements are not fulfilled. The end product produces enormous errors, faults or incorrect results. 0 - 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All required features present in the interface within the required scope, but some are simplified. Or one or two features are missing. The system is able to run with minor errors. 5 - 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All required features present in the interface within or beyond the required scope. No bugs apparent during demonstration. 8 - 10	
4	Program Model Optimization (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The model is not optimized. Most of the processes are executed in serial. Only 1 parallel program model is used. 0 - 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The model is optimized by using more than 1 parallel program model, e.g., SPMD, loop parallelism. 5 - 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The model is optimized by using more than 1 parallel program model, e.g., SPMD, loop parallelism. The model is tested on different parallel platforms, e.g., OpenMP, CUDA, MPI etc, in homogeneous or heterogeneous. 8 - 10	
5	System implementation (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The end product is produced with a different system design or approach, which is not related to the initial proposal. 0 - 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The end product conforms to most of the system design, but some are different from the specification. 5 - 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The end product fully conforms to the proposed system design. 8 - 10	
6	Presentation (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student is unclear about the work produced, sometimes not even knowing where to find the source code. 0 - 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student knows the code whereabouts, but sometimes may not be clear why the work was done in such a way. 5 - 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student is clear about every piece of the work done. 8 - 10	
Sum of Score					

Appendix 2 – Assessment Rubric (Part B) 60% – CLO1

Final Report (40%)

No	Item	Criteria				Final Marks
		Missing or Unacceptable	Poor	Accomplished	Good	
1	Title and abstract (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title or abstract were omitted or inappropriate given the problem, research questions and method. <p>0 - 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title or abstract lacks relevance or fails to offer appropriate details about the education issue, variables, context, or methods of the proposed study. <p>3 - 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title and abstract are relevant, offering details about the proposed research study. <p>6 - 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title and abstract are informative, succinct, and offer sufficiently specific details about the educational issue, variables, context, and proposed methods of the study. <p>9 - 10</p>	
2	Results (Performance measurement) (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical methods were missing or inappropriately aligned with data and research design. Results were confusing. <p>0 - 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical methods were identified but the results were confusing, incomplete or lacked relevance to the research questions, data, or research design. <p>3 - 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analytical methods were identified. Results were presented. All were related to the research question and design. Sufficient metric or measurement is applied. <p>6 - 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical methods and results presentation were sufficient, specific, clear, structured and appropriate based on the research questions and research design. Extra metric or measurement is applied. <p>9 - 10</p>	
3	Discussion and Conclusion (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions or answers to the research question and system performance were omitted or confusing. No or very little conclusion could be yielded. <p>0 - 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little discussions were presented. Answers to the research question and system performance were unclear or confusing. <p>3 - 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions of the results were presented. The research question and system performance were answered and identified. <p>6 - 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The significance of the results of the work was discussed, sufficiently inclusive of the information that concluded and answered the research question and system performance is evaluated comprehensively. Limitations and future improvements of the studies were identified. <p>9 - 10</p>	
4	Organization (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of the paper was incomprehensible, irrelevant, or confusing. Transition was awkward. <p>0 - 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure of the paper was weak. Transition was weak and difficult to understand. <p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A workable structure was presented for presenting ideas. Transition was smooth and clear. <p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structure was intuitive and sufficiently inclusive of important information of the research. Transition from one to another was smooth and organized. <p>5</p>	
5	Spelling, Grammar and Writing Mechanics (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were so many errors that meaning was obscured, make the content became difficult to understand <p>0 - 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some grammar or spelling errors were spotted. Some sentences were awkwardly constructed so that the reader was occasionally distracted. <p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were occasional errors, but they did not represent a major distraction or obscure meaning. <p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sentences were well-phrased. The writing was free or almost free of errors. <p>5</p>	
Sum of Score						
Final score = sum of scores/100*60 (base 60%)						