1. **Assessment Criteria for Assignment (Group Project) (40%)**
   Group Assignment involves the submission of programming code and report for grading, oral presentation. The breakdown of assessment components is as follows.

   - Correctness and completeness of Class and Sequence Diagram design, Design consideration and coding (50%)
   - Quality of demonstration presentation (20%)
   - Report (10%)
   - Individual Q&A (20%)

Assessment Criteria for Assignment (Group Project)	Standards		
	Fail standard (0-39%)	**Pass standard (40-74%)**	**High standard (75-100%)**
Correctness and completeness of Class and Sequence Diagram design, Design consideration and coding (LO 1, 2, 3)	The depicted diagrams given contain serious design and logical flaws, showing misunderstanding of the basic concepts or design principles. The implementation of the design contains bugs that prevent the program to run correctly. Result of the empirically complexity analysis of the problem shows the design lack in reusability, maintainability, and extensibility.	The depicted diagrams are mostly correct, except for some details in the derivation. The implementation runs smoothly (although some minor components need be added or debugged, or the efficiency can be improved). Results of the empirically complexity analysis of the problem shows the design consideration cater for either 2 of reusability, maintainability, and extensibility.	The depicted diagrams show thorough and deep understanding of the key concepts and techniques. Design principle applied and consideration made are correct. The implementation of the design in real code runs correctly and efficiently on different input and parameters. Results of empirical analysis of the problem shows the design consideration cater for reusability, maintainability and extensibility. Furthermore, students can run extra miles to gain novel insights into future enhancement and merits of their design.

Quality of demonstration presentation (LO 1, 2, 3)	The presentation is disorganized, with insufficient content. The computer program fails to run or crashes during the demo. The speaker reads aloud from the slides or notes. The student shows lack of knowledge or confidence and needs much help from other students. The demonstration lacks logical flow for audience better understanding.	The presentation covers the essential parts of a project. It is overall well organized. The speaker can speak clearly, although needs some rehearsal to improve the presentation. Some grammatical errors appear in the spoken language. The demonstration is organised with most features explained.	The presentation is well-organised, comprehensive, and balanced in content. The speaker can capture the essential points of a problem and describe their methods and results clearly and precisely. The demonstration is succinct with logical flow to illustrate all required features with clear explanation of ideas.
Quality of Report **(LO 1, 2)**	The content of report is insufficient to cover the required components. The writing is sketchy, contains numerous grammatical or typographical errors. The logical structure is shaky, e.g. the conclusion cannot be supported by evidence given.	The content contains most of the required components. The writing is comprehensible but contains some errors or ambiguity. The report may miss out crucial information and should give more space for relatively more important parts. Some proofreading and revision may be needed to improve the quality of writing.	The content is not only correct and complete, but also well-written (e.g. logical, coherent, clear). The structure of the report is logically well organized and balanced. There are almost no grammatical or typographical errors. Figures and tables are presented with clarity and useful information.
Individual Q&A	Student is unable to respond appropriately to inquiries during the engagement with the examiner. Explanations demonstrate weak understanding.	Student can r**espond appropriately** to inquiries and **seek clarification** when needed during the engagement with the examiner. Explanations are **concise**, demonstrating **reasonable** depth of understanding.	Student can **adapt** responses to audience's needs and encourage **interactivity** during the engagement with the examiner. Explanations are **persuasive**, demonstrating **in-depth** understanding.

Peer Assessment (Each student will fill up a peer assessment form independently.)	Poor participation and contribution to the team project.	Moderate participation and contribution to the team project.	Excellent participation and contribution to the team project.