

COSC2804 2023 Semester 1 (Apr24) | Rubric | Milestone 1

	Weight	Elements	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Poor (1.5)	NN (0)
UX/UI Ideation	5 marks	(1) Wireframes have appropriate sizing, labelled with clear lines and clear descriptions; (2) UX/UI satisfies relevant Nielsen design heuristics; (3) UX/UI satisfies relevant Personas; (4) UX/UI employs appropriate UI elements; (5) Explains what the Ideation allows the user to accomplish and how it should be used.	Ideations clearly caters for the requirements of Levels 1, 2 and 3 .	Ideations mostly caters for the requirements of Levels 1, 2 and 3 with some errors.	Ideations suitably caters for the requirements of Levels 1 and 2 . Ideations may not suitably cater for the requirements of Level 3.	Ideations suitably caters for the requirements of Level 1 . Ideations may not suitably cater for the requirements of Levels 2 and 3.	Insufficient for Poor category
			Wireframes are fully complete, clear and easy to understand. All UX/UI elements are presented and clearly labelled. There is no question on how the subtask elements are met.	Wireframes are mostly clear. Most UX/UI elements are presented and labelled, but important elements are unclear . There are some questions on how the subtask elements are met.	Wireframes can be understood , with most elements to make a usable UX/UI presented. Labels are limited , and some UX/UI elements may be missing . It is unclear how the subtask requirements can be met.	Wireframes are difficult to understand, have poor layout, poor sizing, and/or missing labels. It is confusing how the subtask requirements can be met and the UX/UI used.	
			UX/UI satisfies all relevant Nielsen design heuristics. The explanation is clear, justified , and considers all relevant Nielsen design heuristics.	UX/UI satisfies most of the relevant Nielsen design heuristics. The explanation is satisfactory and considers most Nielsen design heuristics with minor issues .	UX/UI satisfies some of the relevant Nielsen design heuristics. The explanation considers at least 5 Nielsen design heuristics, but may contains significant inconsistencies .	UX/UI satisfies few of the relevant Nielsen design heuristics. The explanation is minimal .	
			UX/UI satisfies the needs & goals of all Personas. The explanation is clear and justified	UX/UI mostly satisfies the needs & goals of all Personas, but there are minor issues . The explanation is satisfactory	UX/UI satisfies the needs & goals of one Personas. The explanation is satisfactory	The explanation attempts to relates the UX/UI to the needs & goals of the Persona but is confusing or unclear .	
			UI features are well chosen , and use all relevant Design Patterns. Descriptions are excellent and refer to all relevant Design Patterns.	Features of the UI are mostly well chosen, and mostly use relevant Design Patterns, with some issues. Descriptions are suitable and refer to the Design Patterns that are used.	Features of the UI make minimal use of Design Patterns, with errors or inconsistencies . Descriptions are missing complete consideration of Design Patterns.	Features of the UI make no use of Design Patterns. Descriptions of the quality of the UX/UI are presented, but do not consider Design Patterns.	
Database Model	5 marks	(1) ER Model is presented in the form of an ER Diagram; (2) ER Diagram follows UML notation used in class, including entity, attribute, entity key, relationship and cardinality representations; (3) Suitability of the design is explained.	ER Model is clearly suited for storing all of the data that supports the requirements of Levels 1, 2 and 3 .	ER Model is mostly suited for storing the data that supports the requirements of Levels 1, 2, and 3 .	ER Model is suitable for storing the data that supports the requirements of Levels 1 and 2 . The ER Model is inadequate for Level 3.	ER Model is mostly suited for storing the data that supports the requirements of Level 1 . The ER Model is inadequate for Levels 2 and 3.	Insufficient for Poor category
			ER Diagram uses correct notation to represent all information.	ER Diagram contains minor issues in the notation, such as using arrows, or inconsistent lines.	ER Diagram contains significant errors in the notation, such as missing notation or incorrect use of symbols.	Use of notation in the ER Diagram has been poorly considered, however, the ER Model is still interpretable .	
			ER Diagram capture all of the required entities, attributes, entity keys, and cardinality relationships. The explanation is clear and well justified .	ER Diagram capture all of the entities. There may be minor issues with attributes or relationships, such as missing attributes, entity keys, and/or cardinality relationships. The explanation is suitability justified .	ER Diagram captures most of the entities, attributes and their relationships with significant errors , such as incorrect entity, entity keys, and/or cardinality relationships. The ER Model is described but is weakly justified.	ER Diagram contains major errors , such as missing multiple entities, attributes, entity keys, and/or cardinality relationships. The ER model explanation is minimal .	
	Weight	Elements	Excellent (2)	Good (1.5)	Fair (1)	Poor (0.5)	NN (0)
Database Relational Schema	2 marks	(1) Relational Schema correspond to the ER Model; (2) Relational Schema contains all necessary tables, attributes, and keys.	Relational Schema fully corresponds to the ER Model, with no errors.	Relational Schema mostly corresponds to the ER Model, with minor issues .	Relational Schema corresponds to the ER Model, with no more than one significant issue .	Relational Schema has at least one element that corresponds to the ER Model.	Insufficient for Poor category
			Relational Schema contains all tables, attributes, and keys.	Relational Schema contains all tables, and attributes. There may be minor errors with the keys.	Relational Schema contains most tables, and attributes, but a table may be missing. There may be errors with the keys.	Relational Schema contains at least one table with correct attributes and keys.	
	Weight	Elements	Excellent (3)	Good (2)	Poor (1)		NN (0)
Teamwork & Peer Assessment	3 marks	(1) Teamwork Peer Assessment and Contribution Document; (2) Organisation: regularity of activity, timeframe of completion of tasks; (3) Contribution: distribution, quality, and regularity; (4) Communication: regularity and suitability; (5) Teamwork is conducted over the entire course of the assessment.	Team member has completed the Teamwork Contribution and Peer Review Form.	Team member has completed the Teamwork Contribution and Peer Review Form.	Team member may not have completed the Teamwork Contribution and Peer Review Form.		Insufficient for Poor category
			Team member has significant activity, and regular completion of tasks over the entire course of the assessment as evident through the group's private MS Team.	Team member has some lack of regular activity, and/or late completion of tasks at times during the assessment, as evident through the group's private MS Team.	Team member has sporadic or late activity, and/or an untimely completion of tasks, throughout the assessment as evident through the group's private MS Team.		
			Team member has significant and regular contribution to Milestone 1 over the entire course of the assessment as evident on the group's private MS Team and the Contribution Form.	Team member has some lack of regular contribution Milestone 1 at times during the assessment as evident on the group's private MS Team and the Contribution Form.	Team member minimally sufficient contributions to Milestone 1, but are on an irregular basis throughout the assessment, as evident on the group's private MS Team and the Contribution Form.		
			Team member maintains regular communication with the other team member(s) over the entire course of the assessment as evident on the group's private MS Team.	Team member has some lack of regular communication with the other team member(s) at times during the assessment as evident on the group's private MS Team.	Team member has minimal, inconsistent and/or irregular communication with the other team member(s) throughout the assessment as evident on the group's private MS Team.		