# AMIT2043 Web Systems and Technologies

# Assignment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Programme : AMIT2043 Web Systems and Technologies** | |
| **Tutorial Class : Group 4** | |
| **Society / Club : Chinese Society** | |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **No.** | **Student Name** | **Student ID** | **Total Mark (100)** | | **1** | Chaw Chun Jia | 23WMD02608 |  | | **2** | Goh Chun Wen | 23WMD02211 |  | | **3** | Ooi Jun Kang | 23WMD02732 |  | | **4** | Wong Shun Bin | 23WMD02292 |  | | |
| **Lecturer: Mr. CHUA CHI LOG** | **Practical Tutor : Mr. LAM KAH FAI** |
| **Date of Submission: 6/5/2024** | |

**Group Assignment: Marking Rubric**

**Prototype**

| **NO** | **CRITERIA** | **TOTAL**  **MARK** | **Poor** | **Average** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **MARK** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Web design, System Prototype and HTML Form Controls | 30 | **0 – 7 marks**  Poor design website, not related to the society and event, difficult to view the information.  Poor web prototype shows minimal part of the usability and functional of the system.  HTML form controls are used inappropriately. Fail to minimize input errors. | **8 – 16 marks**  Poor design website, but easy to view the information.  Average web prototype shows some of the usability and the  functioning of the system  Few of the right HTML form controls are used correctly. Able to minimize some of the input errors. | **17 - 25 marks**  A good and consistent website. Easy to view the information.  Good and detailed web  prototype shows the  complete usability and the functioning of the system  Most of HTML form controls are used correctly. Able to minimize most of the input errors. | **26 – 30 marks**  Excellent, consistent, and attractive website.  Excellent and detailed  System prototype shows the complete usability and the functioning of the system.  All HTML form controls are well structured and the right HTML controls are used correctly to minimize most of the input errors. |  |
|  | | **30** | **TOTAL MARK:** | | | |  |

**System**

| **NO** | **CRITERIA** | **TOTAL**  **MARK** | **Poor** | **Average** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **MARK** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Database | 10 | **0 – 2 mark**  Poor database design. Some fields are missing. Field properties are not set (i.e. left to default). | **3 – 5 marks**  Average database design with all fields. Some field properties are not set accordingly. | **6 – 8 marks**  Good database design with all fields and appropriate properties (field size, data type, etc). | **9 – 10 marks**  Good database design with correct relationship defined. |  |
| 2. | Functionality: - Listing, Insert, Update, Delete, Search and Filter | 30 | **0 – 7 marks**  Many requirements are not achieved. Module does not work as expected or contains a lot of flaws. | **8 – 16 marks**  Few requirements are not achieved. Module still works with little or some acceptable flaws. | **17 – 25 marks**  All requirements are achieved. Module works as expected. But no enhancement added. | **26 – 30 marks**  All requirements are achieved. Module works perfectly. Enhancements are added. |  |
| 3. | Programming Logic and Style | 10 | **0 – 2 marks**  Poor programming logic. Source codes are not readable and hard to understand. Variable names are not meaningful. Standard and convention are not followed. No comments are used. | **3 – 5 marks**  Average programming logic. Source codes are less readable and need more time to understand. Most of the variable names are meaningful. Standard and convention are followed sometimes. Comments are used. | **6 – 8 marks**  Good programming logic. Source code is structured, effective, readable, and easy to understand. Variable names are meaningful. Standard and convention are followed. Comments are used. | **9 – 10 marks**  Very good programming logic. Source code is very well-structured, effective, well-tested, highly readable, and easy to understand. Variable names are meaningful. Standard and convention are followed. Comments are used appropriately. |  |
| 4. | Usability | 10 | **0 – 2 marks**  Poor society/event management system, very minimal functions.  Not user friendly and hard to use.  Not ready to deploy and not able to use by the society. | **3 – 5 marks**  Average society/event management system, average functions added. Easy to use.  Not ready to deploy and a lot of improved need to be used by the society. | **6 – 8 marks**  Good user experience in society/event management system. Useful functions added. User friendly and easy to use.  Able to deploy and be used by the society with minimal improvement. | **9 – 10 marks**  Excellent user experience in society/event management system. Excellent functions added.  Very user friendly and easy to use.  Ready to deploy and used by the society. |  |
| 5. | Additional Features | 10 | **0 – 2 marks**  No or very primitive features are added, which require no or only a little coding effort. | **3 – 5 marks**  Simple features are added, which are easy to implement, and work well. | **6 – 8 marks**  Features added are useful, required some coding efforts, and are implemented correctly. | **9 – 10 marks**  Features added are very useful, required a lot of coding efforts, and are implemented perfectly. |  |
|  | | **70** | **TOTAL MARK:** | | | |  |

**Additional Feedback (if any):**

|  |
| --- |
|  |