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BAIT2133 Web Engineering Assignment Presentation Rubric

Student’s Full Name: 1. Koay Fu Hao 2. Lee Min

RUBRIC

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Explanation on Content | | Understanding of the Concept | |
| Max Marks | 10 | | 10 | |
| Poor | Do not present the information, ideas or findings clearly. Audience cannot understand the presentation. (0-2m) | | Unable to answer the question asked by the audience.  (0-2m) | |
| Average | Able to present the ideas but some information is not clear. Sometimes it's hard to understand the points. (3-5m) | | Audience may still be confused after listening to the reply from the speaker.  (3-5m) | |
| Good | Overall presentation is clear but may have minor parts that need further explanation from the speaker.  (6-8m) | | Able to give respond to audience but with omissions or flaws  (6-8m) | |
| Excellent | Clear and structured presentation of the information, ideas and findings.  (9-10m) | | Give a good response by using example/ illustration when answering questions from the audience.  (9-10m) | |
|  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Marks |  |  |  |  |
| Comments |  | |  | |

BAIT2133 Web Engineering Assignment Rubric

Student’s Full Name: 1. Koay Fu Hao 2. Lee Min

RUBRIC

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Problem Statement | Development Plan | Elicit Requirement | Requirement Model | Content Model |
| Max Marks | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Poor | The problems & solutions list is incomplete.  (0-1m) | Incomplete and inappropriate plan.  (0-1m) | The elicitation activities and requirements list is incomplete.  (0-2m) | Incomplete and inappropriate use cases, actors, relationship or use case descriptions.  (0-2m) | The Content diagram with attributes and associations incomplete and illogical.  (0-2m) |
| Average | The problems & solutions list covers moderate requirements.  (2-3m) | The plan covers moderate requirements.  (2-3m) | The elicitation activities and requirements list covers moderate requirements.  (3-5m) | Complete provision of the required use case diagrams with scenarios, use case descriptions for each use case but contains flaws or omissions in notation and appropriateness.  (3-5m) | The Content diagram with attributes and associations complete but contains flaws or omissions.  (3-5m) |
| Good | The problems & solutions are clearly described.  (4m) | The plan are clearly described.  (4m) | The content overall are clearly described.  (6-8m) | Appropriate label in use case diagrams and the use case descriptions are clearly described.  (6-8m) | The Content diagram is with correct labels, no mistakes in logic design and use of notation.  (6-8m) |
| Excellent | The problems & solutions are clearly described and well structured.  (5m) | The plan are clearly described and well structured.  (5m) | The content are comprehensively described and well-structured.  (9-10m) | The use cases are well organized and the use case descriptions are clearly described and cover impressive aspects of the requirements.  (9-10m) | The content model is with a very good and meaningful label and correct logic.  (9-10m) |
| Marking | Student as above | Student as above | Student as above | Student as above | Student as above |
| Marks |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments |  |  |  |  |  |

BAIT2133 Web Engineering Assignment Rubric

Student’s Full Name: 1. Koay Fu Hao 2. Lee Min

RUBRIC

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Hypertext Model | Presentation Model | | Functional Model | | Interaction Model | | Configuration Model |
| Max Marks | 10 | 10 | | 10 | | 10 | | 5 |
| Poor | The hypertext diagram is incomplete and illogical.  (0-2m) | The presentation model is incomplete and illogical.  (0-2m) | | The functional model flows are incomplete and illogical.  (0-2m) | | The interaction model is incomplete and illogical.  (0-2m) | | The configuration model is incomplete.  (0-1m) |
| Average | The hypertext diagram is complete but contains flaws or omissions.  (3-5m) | The presentation model is complete but contains flaws or omissions.  (3-5m) | | The functional model flows show some understanding but contain flaws or omissions.  (3-5m) | | The interaction model is complete with events carried out by boundary, control and entity objects but contains flaws or omissions.  (3-5m) | | The configuration model covers moderate requirements.  (2-3m) |
| Good | The hypertext diagram has no mistakes in logic design and use of notation.  (6-8m) | The presentation model is with labeling and no mistakes in design.  (6-8m) | | The functional model is with label and no mistakes in logic design and use of notation.  (6-8m) | | The interaction model is with labelling and no mistakes in logic design and use of notation.  (6-8m) | | The configuration model is clearly described.  (4m) |
| Excellent | The hypertext diagram is with very good and meaningful label.  (9-10m) | The presentation model is with very good and meaningful label.  (9-10m) | | The functional model is with very good and meaningful label.  (9-10m) | | The interaction model is with very good and meaningful label.  (9-10m) | | The configuration model is clearly described and well structured.  (5m) |
|  | Student as above | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | Student as above |
| Marks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments |  |  | |  | |  | |  |