

This work has already been evaluated and released to the author. Use the tabs to the top right to view the evaluation report and work.

## Evaluation Results

**AUTHOR:** Mitchell Bryant

**DATE EVALUATED:** 07/12/2017 07:47:46 AM (MDT)

**DRF TEMPLATE:** IT - Management of Data Application (UG, C170, VHT1-0116)

**PROGRAM:** IT - Management of Data Application (UG, C170, VHT1-0116)

**EVALUATION METHOD :** Using Rubric

**FINAL SCORE**  
**Meets**  
**Requirement**

7/12/17 - The submission includes accurate 1NF, 2NF, and 3NF tables; a logical entity-relationship diagram; and the SQL code and screenshots that evidence the code was successfully executed. All task requirements have been met.

## Detailed Results

### ARTICULATION OF RESPONSE (CLARITY, ORGANIZATION, MECHANICS)

#### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate provides unsatisfactory articulation of response.

#### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides weak articulation of response.

#### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides adequate articulation of response.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

## Competent

### A1A. TABLE IN FIRST NORMAL FORM

#### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide a table in first normal form that fulfills the given requirements.

#### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides a table in first normal form that fulfills some of the given requirements or is inaccurate.

#### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides a table in first normal form that fulfills the given requirements and is accurate.

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

#### COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:

7/10/2017 - All required data elements from the sales order form was provided in the table submitted. The appropriate composite primary key was assigned.

7/7/17 - The submission provided a single table to define the 1st normal form table. A 1st normal form table that properly defined the composite primary key was not evident. The calculated field should be removed.

### A1AI. EXPLANATION FOR FIRST NORMAL FORM

#### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide a logical explanation of how the table was designed.

#### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with insufficient detail, of how the table was designed.

#### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with sufficient detail, of how the table was designed.

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/10/2017 - The submission includes a detailed discussion about how the first normal form table design was achieved.

7/7/17 - The submission provided an explanation that discussed how the 1st normal form table was designed. This aspect can be updated when the 1st normal form table is revised.

**A1B. TABLE IN SECOND NORMAL FORM****1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not provide tables in second normal form that fulfill the given requirements.

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

The candidate provides tables in second normal form that fulfill some of the given requirements or are inaccurate.

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate provides tables in second normal form that fulfill the given requirements and are accurate.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/12/17 - The submission includes three tables in accurate 2NF with primary and foreign keys appropriately identified.

7/10/2017 - Three tables were provided with all fields assigned to the correct tables. All primary keys have been correctly assigned, however, the composite foreign key for the line table was not designated and needs to be identified as well.

7/7/17 - The submission provided 3 tables to define the 2nd normal form table. A 2nd normal form table that properly distributed the attributes was not evident. The customer and donut order tables need to be revised.

**A1BI. EXPLANATION FOR SECOND NORMAL FORM****1. NOT EVIDENT****2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE****3. COMPETENT**

The candidate does not provide a logical explanation of how the tables were designed.

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with insufficient detail, of how the tables were designed.

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with sufficient detail, of how the tables were designed.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/10/2017 - The submission includes an accurate explanation for how the tables were divided. The explanation also sufficiently explains how the composite primary key fields are also foreign keys.

7/7/17 - The submission provided an explanation that discussed how the 2nd normal form table was designed. This aspect can be updated when the 2nd normal form table is revised.

**A1C. NORMALIZED TABLE IN THIRD NORMAL FORM**

**1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not provide tables in third normal form that fulfill the given requirements.

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

The candidate provides tables in third normal form that fulfill some of the given requirements or are inaccurate.

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate provides tables in third normal form that fulfill the given requirements and are accurate.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/10/2017 - Four tables are presented for third normal form design with all values assigned to the correct tables. All primary keys and foreign keys are accurately designated for each table.

7/7/17 - The submission provided 4 tables (customer, donutorder, donut and line) to define the 3rd normal form table. A donutorder table to accurately defined attributes was not evident.

## A1CI. EXPLANATION FOR 3RD NORMAL FORM

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide a logical explanation of how the table was designed.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with insufficient detail, of how the table was designed.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with sufficient detail, of how the table was designed.

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

#### COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:

7/10/2017 - An accurate, detailed explanation was provided to explain how the tables were designed for this task.

7/7/17 - The submission provided an explanation that discussed how the 3rd normal form table was designed. This aspect can be updated when the 3rd normal form table is revised.

## B1. ER DIAGRAM: ENTITIES FOR TABLES

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with entities that represent *each* of the tables from the third normalized form.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with entities that inaccurately represent *each* of the tables from the third normalized form, or *all* the tables are not represented.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with entities that accurately represent *each* of the tables from the third normalized form.

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

### COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:

7/7/17 - The submission provided an entity relationship diagram that contained the tables defined in the 3rd normal form table.

## B2. ER DIAGRAM: APPROPRIATE FIELDS

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with *all* appropriate fields entered into *each* of the entities.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with appropriate fields entered into *each* of the entities, but some fields are illogical or missing.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with *all* appropriate fields logically entered into *each* of the entities.

### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

## B2A. ER DIAGRAM: PRIMARY KEYS AND FOREIGN KEYS

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with primary keys and foreign keys designated.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with inaccurate or illogical primary keys and foreign keys designated.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with logical and accurate primary keys and foreign keys designated.

### CRITERION SCORE :

## Competent

### COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:

7/7/17 - The submission provided an entity relationship diagram that properly define both the primary and foreign keys for each of the entities.

## B2B. ER DIAGRAM: DATA TYPES

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with data types designated for *each* attribute.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with inaccurate or illogical data types designated for *each* attribute.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with accurate and logical data types designated for *each* attribute.

### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

## B3. ER DIAGRAM: RELATIONSHIPS LABELED

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with relationships drawn between the entities accurately labeled with a relationship name.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with relationships drawn between the entities inaccurately labeled with a relationship name.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides an entity-relationship diagram, using tables designed in third normal form from part A1c, with relationships drawn between the entities accurately labeled with a relationship name.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/7/17 - The submission provided an entity relationship diagram that properly labeled each of the relationships between the entities.

**B4A. EXPLANATION OF SELECTION OF ENTITIES**

**1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not provide a logical explanation of why the entities represented in the diagram were selected.

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with insufficient detail, of why the entities represented in the diagram were selected.

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with sufficient detail, of why the entities represented in the diagram were selected.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/10/2017 - A detailed rationalization was provided for why entities included in the diagram were selected.

7/7/17 - The submission provided an explanation that discussed how the primary keys were determined for each of the tables. An explanation that provided adequate support for why the entities represented in the diagram were selected was not evident.

**B4B. EXPLANATION OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ENTITIES**

**1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

The candidate provides a

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate provides a



provide a logical explanation of how the relationship between the entities was determined.

logical explanation, with insufficient detail, of how the relationship between the entities was determined.

logical explanation, with sufficient detail, of how the relationship between the entities was determined.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/10/2017 - The submission provides a valid detailed discussion about how the relationships for the ER diagram were selected.

7/7/17 - The submission provided an explanation that discussed that the relationships was determined by looking at the process of ordering a donut. An explanation that supported how the relationship between the entities would determine was not evident.

**B4C. EXPLANATION OF TYPES OF RELATIONSHIPS OR CARDINALITY**

**1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not provide a logical explanation of the types of relationships or cardinality used in the diagram.

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with insufficient detail, of the types of relationships or cardinality used in the diagram.

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate provides a logical explanation, with sufficient detail, of the types of relationships or cardinality used in the diagram.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/7/17 - The submission provided an explanation that accurately discussed the cardinality for each of the entities.

**C1. SQL CODE:TABLES**

**1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not provide the SQL code written for *each* table.

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

The candidate provides inaccurate or illogical SQL code written for *each* table.

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate provides accurate and logical SQL code that was written for *each* table.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/7/17 - The create table SQL command was used to create each of the tables defined in the 3rd normal form table.

**C1A. TABLES: SCREENSHOT OF SQL CODE RESULTS****1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not demonstrate that the code from part C1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

Not applicable.

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate demonstrates that the code from part C1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/7/17 - The submission provided a screenshot that demonstrated that the SQL code use the create each of the tables was properly tested.

**D1. SQL CODE:"VIEW" FOR CUSTOMER INFORMATION**

**1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not provide the SQL code written for the "View" for customer information.

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

The candidate provides inaccurate or illogical SQL code written for the "View" for customer information.

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate provides accurate and logical SQL code written for the "View" for customer information.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/10/2017 - The SQL for creating a view of all of the customer information with the first and last name fields concatenated was provided.

7/7/17 - The create table SQL command was used to create view for the customer information. A view that contained all of the customer information was not evident.

**D1A. "VIEW": SCREENSHOT OF SQL CODE RESULTS****1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not demonstrate that the code from part D1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

Not applicable.

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate demonstrates that the code from part D1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/10/2017 - A screenshot was included that contains the testing of the CREATE VIEW statement.

7/7/17 - The submission provided a screenshot that displayed the SQL code in D1. This aspect can be updated when D1 is revised.

## E1. SQL CODE:"INDEX" OF DONUT INFORMATION

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide the SQL code written to create the "Index" for donut information.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides inaccurate or illogical SQL code written to create the "Index" for donut information.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides accurate and logical SQL code written to create the "Index" for donut information.

### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

### COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:

7/10/2017 - A CREATE INDEX statement that correctly creates the index on the name field of the donut table was provided.

7/7/17 - The submission use the create index SQL command to create an index for the donut information. An index created on the correct attributes was not evident.

## E1A. "INDEX": SCREENSHOT OF SQL CODE RESULTS

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not demonstrate that the code from part E1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

Not applicable

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate demonstrates that the code from part E1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

### COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:

7/10/2017 - The submission includes a screenshot demonstrating the successful execution of the create index statement and its results.

7/7/17 - The submission provided a screenshot that demonstrated that the SQL code in E1 was executed. A screenshot that demonstrated that E1 was properly tested was not evident.

## F1. SQL CODE:DATA POPULATION

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide the SQL code written to insert data into the tables.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides inaccurate or illogical SQL code written to insert data into the tables.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides accurate and logical SQL code written to insert data into *all* of the tables.

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

#### COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:

7/7/17 - The insert into SQL command was used to populate data into each of the tables defined in the 3rd normal form table.

## F1A. DATA: SCREENSHOT OF SQL CODE RESULTS

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not demonstrate that the code from part F1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

Not applicable.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate demonstrates that the code from part F1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

## G1. SQL CODE:SIMPLE (SFW) QUERIES

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide SQL code written for the simple (sfw) queries to display the data in the tables that were created and populated.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides inaccurate or illogical SQL code written for simple (sfw) queries to display the data in the tables that were created and populated.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides accurate and logical SQL code written for the simple (sfw) queries to display *all* of the data in *each* of the tables that were created and populated.

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

#### COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:

7/7/17 - The submission use the select\* SQL command to display all of the data in each of the tables.

## G1A. SIMPLE (SFW) QUERIES: SCREENSHOT OF SQL CODE RESULTS

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not demonstrate that the code from part G1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

Not applicable.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate demonstrates that the code from part G1 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

## G2. SQL CODE:COMPLEX JOIN QUERY

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not provide the SQL code written for the complex join query to display information contained in the attached "Sales Order Form."

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

The candidate provides inaccurate or illogical SQL code written for a complex join query to display information contained in the attached "Sales Order Form."

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate provides accurate and logical SQL code written for a complex join query to display *all* of the information contained in the attached "Sales Order Form."

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

#### COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:

7/10/2017 - The submission includes a complex join with the tables accurately joined and all of the data from all of the tables included.

7/7/17 - The submission provided a single select query that included all of the tables in the 3rd normal form table. A complex join query that properly joined all of the tables in the 3rd normal form table to display all of the information in the Sales Order Form was not evident.

## G2A. COMPLEX JOIN QUERY: SCREENSHOT OF SQL CODE RESULTS

### 1. NOT EVIDENT

The candidate does not demonstrate that the code from part G2 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

### 2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE

Not applicable.

### 3. COMPETENT

The candidate demonstrates that the code from part G2 was tested by providing a screenshot of the results.

#### CRITERION SCORE :

**Competent**

**COMMENTS ON THIS CRITERION:**

7/10/2017 - The submission includes a screenshot of the execution of the code used to create a complex join query and the results.

7/7/17 - The submission provided a screenshot for the results for G2. This aspect can be updated when G2 is revised.

**H. SUBMISSION FORMAT****1. NOT EVIDENT**

The candidate does not submit parts A–G as a \*.pdf (Portable Document Format) to TaskStream.

**2. APPROACHING COMPETENCE**

Not applicable.

**3. COMPETENT**

The candidate submits parts A–G as a \*.pdf (Portable Document Format) to TaskStream.

**CRITERION SCORE :**

**Competent**