# **ID721001: Mobile Application Development**

# **Project 2: Travelling Application Marking Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **10-9** | **8-7** | **6-5** | **4-0** |
| **Functionality** | The mobile application demonstrates comprehensive and robust evidence on the following:   * Runs smoothly in Visual Studio Code without code/file structure modifications. * Seamlessly usable across various devices. * Virtually bug-free, exceptional usability. * Published on Google Play Store or Apple App Store with provided credentials. * Downloadable and installable from app store on multiple devices. * Country data fetched using Axios, displayed in a FlatList with name and flag. * Text translation implemented using Yandex Translate API with feedback. * Text to speech support implemented with correct handling of input and unsupported countries. * Two well-known phrases selected and integrated seamlessly. * Web view implemented effectively. * Google Map integrated, displaying attractions with proper markers and theme. * Image gallery of tourist attractions displayed effectively. * Interactive quiz for each country implemented meeting requirements. * Splash screen and app icon chosen appropriately and effectively used. * Visually appealing UI with consistent theme and style. | The mobile application demonstrates clear and detailed evidence of functionality on the following:   * Minor setup issues that can be easily resolved. * Minor responsiveness issues on a few devices. * Minor bugs with minimal usability impact. * Published with minor issues, credentials given. * Installable on most devices with minor issues. * Data fetched and displayed with minor issues. * Translation mostly functional, minor issues in feedback. * Mostly functional text to speech, minor input handling issues. * Phrases integrated with minor issues. * Functioning web view with minor issues. * Map integration with minor marker issues. * Gallery displayed with minor issues in layout or interactions. * Quizzes implemented with minor issues in questions or answers. * Splash screen and app icon chosen and used, some minor inconsistencies. * UI is appealing but lacks some consistency. | The mobile application demonstrates adequate evidence on the following:   * Moderate setup issues requiring some effort to address. * Generally usable, but some devices exhibit usability problems. * Noticeable bugs affecting usability. * Major issues with publishing, credentials provided. * Installation problems affecting most devices. * Significant data fetching or display problems. * Translation problems affecting functionality or feedback. * Significant text to speech problems impacting functionality. * Integration problems affecting phrases functionality. * Web view issues affecting user experience or persistence. * Map integration problems affecting attraction display. * Gallery displayed with issues impacting usability or layout. * Quiz implementation problems affecting functionality. * Inconsistent or inappropriate splash screen and app icon choices affecting app identity. * UI mostly cohesive, with some design inconsistencies. | The mobile application demonstrates evidence on the following:   * Significant setup problems demanding extensive effort. * Unusable on most devices. * Numerous critical bugs severely compromising usability. * Application not published or improper use of provided credentials. * Not installable or severely broken on most devices. * Data fetching consistently fails, severely affecting application. * Translation non-functional, missing feedback handling. * Text to speech non-functional or severely broken. * Phrases not integrated or severely affecting app. * Web view non-functional or persistence missing. * Map integration non-functional or severely broken. * Gallery non-functional or severely affecting application. * Quizzes not implemented or severely broken. * Splash screen and app icon poorly chosen, mismatched, or absent. * UI is visually unappealing and disjointed. |
| **Code Elegance** | The mobile application thoroughly demonstrates code elegance on the following:   * Properly implemented .gitignore and .env files. * Excellent naming and consistent idiomatic usage. * Mastery of control flow and optimal data structures. * Highly efficient algorithms and excellent modularity. * Comprehensive JSDoc and appropriate in-line comments. * Code consistently formatted, minor formatting issues. * Minimal dead or unused code, easily manageable. | The mobile application clearly demonstrates code elegance on the following:   * .gitignore and .env files mostly appropriate. * Good naming and mostly idiomatic usage. * Competent control flow and appropriate data structures. * Good algorithmic efficiency and substantial modularity. * Sufficient JSDoc and relevant in-line comments. * Mostly consistent usage, some formatting deviations. * Some dead or unused code, attention needed | The mobile application code demonstrates adequate code elegance on the following:   * Some issues with .gitignore or .env files. * Fair naming and some idiomatic deviations. * Adequate control flow with some improvements possible. * Reasonable algorithmic approach and moderate modularity. * Basic JSDoc and sporadic in-line comments. * Generally well-formatted code, significant deviations. * Significant amount of dead or unused code, impacts readability. | The mobile application demonstrates code elegance on the following:   * Not implemented or severely incorrect. * Poor naming and non-idiomatic usage. * Major control flow problems. * Serious algorithmic inefficiencies or lack of modularity. * Missing JSDoc and minimal in-line comments. * Code is poorly formatted. * Extensive dead or unused code, severely impacts codebase. |
| **Documentation & Git Usage** | Efficient use of GitHub project board for organisation and prioritisation.  Comprehensive README.md content with all required sections provided clearly.  Effective use of Markdown and high writing quality.  Clear and contextually appropriate Git commit messages with consistent formatting. | Sufficient use of GitHub project board.  Sufficient README.md content, some sections might lack detail.  Competent use of Markdown with few minor issues in writing.  Mostly clear commit messages with minor inconsistencies in formatting. | Adequate use of GitHub project board.  Basic README.md content, some important sections missing or incomplete.  Reasonable Markdown usage, some writing issues.  Some clarity issues in commit messages and formatting inconsistencies. | No or improper use of GitHub project board.  Critical sections missing, inadequate content.  Unclear or inconsistent commit messages and poor formatting.  Unclear or inconsistent commit messages and poor formatting. |
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Out Of** | **Weighting** | **Final Result** |
| Functionality | 10 | 50 |  |
| Code Elegance | 10 | 40 |  |
| Documentation & Git/GitHub Usage | 10 | 10 |  |
| **Final Result** | | | /100 |
| **This assessment is worth 40% of the final mark for the Mobile Application Development course.** | | | |

**Feedback:**

**Functionality:**

**Code Elegance:**

**Documentation & Git Usage:**