Appendix 2 – Assessment Rubric (Part A) 40% – CLO2

Name(s):   Programme: Group: Date:

Criteria	Weak	Average	Good	Excellent	Mark
Introduction (30)	• No or very little discussion on an existing problem and the project The proposed project already exists, or with very minor change. • No discussion or very little introduction given to the related system or technology. 0 - 9	• Little discussion on an existing problem and introduction of a proposed project. • Minor ideas are modified from existing system(s). • Introduction to the related system is given, but no evaluation provided. 10 - 18	• Good discussion and evaluation of an existing problem and the proposed project. • Ideas modified from an existing system, with some creative ideas are added. • Good discussion and evaluation of the related system. 19 - 24	• A very good discussion and evaluation of an existing problem and the proposed project. • Majority of the ideas are creative. • A very good discussion and evaluation of the related system. 25 - 30	
Literature Review (30)	• Contents are retrieved directly from the literature without any paraphrasing. • Selected literature was from unreliable sources (e.g. Web sources). No critical evaluation was provided. 0 - 9	• Summary is lengthy, contents are retrieved directly from the literature without any critical evaluation. • Selected literature was from unreliable sources. Literary supports were vague or ambiguous. 10 - 18	• Summary is concise and clear. Able to identify key constructs and variables related to the research questions, from the relevant, reliable theoretical and research literature. • Discussions on the validity, opinions, arguments and evidence are presented. 19 - 24	• Summary is concise and clear, which integrates critical and logical details from the peer- reviewed theoretical and research literature. • Attention is given to different perspectives, conditionality, threats to validity, and opinion vs. evidence. 25 - 30	
Methodology (30)	• No discussion or very little introduction given to the methods applied. • Brief design is provided but lack of explanation. • Algorithm suggested is not appropriate or less relevant. 0 - 9	• Brief description of system design, with some explanations. • Introduction to the related application of the methods is given, but no evaluation provided. • Algorithm suggested is relevant, but lack of understanding or explanation. 10 - 18	• System design is well-illustrated, and with clear explanation. • Good discussion and evaluation of the methods applied. • Algorithm suggested is relevant and a good explanation shows understanding. 19 - 24	• System design is well-illustrated, with good explanation. • Good discussion and evaluation of the relevant and practical methods applied. • Algorithm suggested is relevant and good explanations to relate to the proposed project. 25 - 30	
Reference (10)	• No proper referencing is done. Only rely on website content, but no research papers. Reference list is not provided. 0 - 2	• Reference list is provided but not with APA Referencing standard. Some mixture of reference sources. 3 - 5	• Referencing is done properly. Some mixture of APA standard reference sources with at least one journal. 6 - 8	• Rich mixture of reference sources especially good quality of research papers. Proper citations are done whenever necessary. Reference list follows the proper APA Referencing standard and the information is complete. 9 - 10	
				Sum of scores	
				Final score = sum of scores/100*40 (base 40%)	