INFO90002 2020 Semester 2 - ASSIGNMENT 1

Date Due:

Group Agreement: Friday 21st August 1800H (6 p.m.) AEDT 2020 (**Assignment Hurdle**)

Assignment Due: Wednesday 9th September 2020 0900H (9 a.m.) AEDT 2020

Weighting: 20% of your total assessment (75% E.R Model 25% Conceptual Model)

Group Assessment: Groups of four (4) students

CASE STUDY:

The Tasmanian Institute of Technology and Research Science – Casual Hire Recruitment System

The Tasmanian Institute of Technology and Research Science has need for a new casual tutor hiring system. The TITRS hires a casual workforce of between 900 – 1500 casual and fixed term contract employees every year. TITRS has eight faculties and over 140 departments. A department can only belong to one faculty.

TITRS has four semesters in any calendar year: Summer; Autumn: Winter and Spring. Summer and Winter semesters are 6 weeks of intensive study, and Autumn and Spring are the standard 12 week semester with a mid semester break after week 6.

TITRS has a number of different timetable and non timetable casual roles. Timetabled roles are Tutors and Demonstrators. The non-timetabled roles include Team Leader, Marker, Supervisor, and a catch all category for meetings, invigilation, forum monitoring, industry liaison labelled as "Other Academic Activity". Tutors are paid to prepare tutorials. Demonstrators are not paid any preparation time. Therefore, if a tutor is delivering a one hour tutorial they are paid for one hour to prepare, two hour tutorial, two hours and so on. This is only for the first tutorial, they are not paid any preparation time for the second, and subsequent tutorials they deliver for that subject (Please see the Appendix for more information).

Any suitably qualified person can apply for these positions however most Faculties and Departments expect candidates to hold the degree they wish to tutor at. For example, you are expected to hold a Bachelor degree to tutor and assess (mark) Bachelor subjects. Masters subjects expect applicants to hold a Master's degree and some Master's tutors already hold a PhD. Applicants who hold a PhD are entitled to a higher rate of pay (refer Appendix A).

Applicants can nominate up to a maximum of four subjects in each Department each semester. Applicants must prioritise this list from 1 to 4. As part of the process, applicants must provide their title, full name, personal email address, Australian tax file number, Working With Children Check number (1234567Z-A1), and nominate their availability from 7am – 10pm Monday to Saturday in hourly increments. In nominating their available times to work, applicants must specify a first and second preference as well as any times they are unavailable to work. Applicants must submit a full academic transcript of their last completed degree, a pdf of their Curriculum Vitae (Resume), and their Australian visa/citizenship status.

The list of semester subjects and classes that will run is available 6 weeks before the beginning of each semester. Each subject will have a combination of some, or all of, lectures (L01), Seminars (S01), Tutorials (T01) and Practicals (sometimes referred to as labs or demonstrations) P01, and Workshops (W01) which are a 60 minute tutorial followed by a 60 minute practical. All workshops are 120 minutes in duration.

For each tutorial, practical or workshop we store the venue, which includes the room number, room name, floor number (G, 1,2,3 etc), building name and building number, the venue capacity, it's GPS coordinates (latitude and longitude eg Centenary building is -42.902570 latitude and 147.327679 longitude), and a campus map of the building with a star indicating its location. Each class runs a minimum of 60 minutes to a maximum of 6 hours in 30-minute increments. Classes can run a minimum of half the term length (e.g. 3 weeks for Winter, Summer; 6 weeks for Autumn, Spring). We need to know which week of the calendar year the class is running, the day name and date. Venues can change during the semester. For example, LAW20200 Consumer Law may run for 4 weeks (Week numbers 10-13) in one venue (e.g. Joannah Storey Lecture Theatre Ground Floor Owen Dixon Law Building) and then change to another venue (e.g. Upper Theatre, Simon Greenleaf building) for weeks 5 until 12 (Week numbers 14-15, 17-22) of the semester.

Each tutorial, practical or workshop must have at least one tutor allocated to it, but some classes can have up to four tutors allocated to the same tutorial at the same time. The Appendix provides some – but not all - information about the venues, subject names, class names to help support your database design.

Every Subject has at least one or more subject coordinators. The subject coordinator is responsible for selecting, rejecting and reviewing the candidate applications. A subject coordinator can coordinate more than one subject in the same semester. About subject coordinators, we record their title, full name, TITRS employee number, email address, office location on campus and an office contact phone number as well as the department and faculty to which they belong.

Once a candidate application has been submitted it is reviewed by the subject coordinator. The application is either rejected, or shortlisted. If a shortlisted application is successful it then moves to either one of two statuses, waitlisted, or successful. Waitlisted applications are applications that may get hired if there are sufficient student enrolments. Only candidates that are selected as 'successful' by the Subject Coordinator can be allocated to a class (tutorial, practical, workshop) in that subject or be given non timetabled roles (e.g. Marker, Supervisor, Head Tutor) for that subject. Non timetabled roles must be specified in total hours across that teaching semester.

Each subject coordinator can set up an email template to notify applicants of their application outcome. Each subject can have a submitted, shortlisted, unsuccessful, waitlisted and successful email template. The length of the template cannot exceed 1500 characters, about the template we store the FROM email address, Subject title and the body of the email. The recipient list is derived from the candidate status for that subject for that year and semester.

TASK: Your group has been asked to provide:

I) A Conceptual model of the TITRS case study in Chen notation

II) A physical Entity Relationship model using Crows Foot notation suitable for a MySQL relational database version 8.0 or higher. The physical E.R model should be based on your Chen conceptual model.

Appendix

In this appendix is supporting information which may assist you in your database model.

Appendix A Payrates for practicals, tutorials and workshops

Tutorials and Repeat Tutorials

Job Description	**Per each hour**	**Rate**
Initial Tutorial	1 hour preparation and 1 Hour delivery	$96.96
Repeat Tutorial	1 hour delivery	$48.48
Initial Tutorial (PhD rate)	1 hour preparation and 1 Hour delivery	$115.98
Repeat Tutorial (PhD Rate)	1 hour delivery	$57.99
Demonstrator	1 hour practical	$45.00
Demonstrator (PhD)	1 hour practical	$55.00
Initial Workshop	1 hour preparation and 1 Hour delivery + 1 hour Demonstration	$141.96
Repeat Workshop	1 Hour delivery + 1 hour Demonstration	$93.48
Initial Workshop (PhD rate)	1 hour preparation and 1 Hour delivery + 1 hour Demonstration	$170.98
Repeat Workshop (PhD rate)	1 Hour delivery + 1 hour Demonstration	$112.99
Other Academic Activity Marking, Meetings, Invigilation etc.	1 hour other academic activity	$47.20
Other Academic Activity (PhD rate) Marking, Meetings, Invigilation etc.	1 hour other academic activity	$56.50

Appendix B Timetable Information

The following is an example of the class timetable for accounting subject "ACC10020 Fundamentals of Financial Accounting" – Autumn 2020

Class	Type	Day name	Start	Finish	Duration	Weeks	Venue	Start Date
ACC10002	Lecture	Wednesday	15:15	17:15	2:00	10-15,17-22	Law-GM15 (Thurgood Marshall Theatre)	4-Mar-2000
ACC10002	Tutorial 01	Monday	13:00	14:00	1:00	11-15,17-22	Durrell-2016	9-Mar-2000
ACC10002	Tutorial 02	Monday	14:00	15:15	1:00	11-15,17-22	Durrell-3033	9-Mar-2000
ACC10002	Tutorial 03	Tuesday	10:00	11:00	1:00	11-15,17-22	Lawrence Bacow-103	10-Mar-2000
ACC10002	Tutorial 04	Tuesday	9:00	10:00	1:00	11-15,17-22	Lawrence Bacow-103	10-Mar-2000
ACC10002	Tutorial 05	Tuesday	15:00	16:00	1:00	11-15,17-22	Durrell-5015	10-Mar-2000
ACC10002	Tutorial 06	Friday	10:00	11:00	1:00	11-15,17-22	Durrell-3033	13-Mar-2000
ACC10002	Tutorial 07	Tuesday	14:00	15:00	1:00	11-15,17-22	Durrell-5015	10-Mar-2000
ACC10002	Tutorial 08	Wednesday	10:00	11:00	1:00	11-15,17-22	Durrell-3033	11-Mar-2000
ACC10002	Tutorial 09	Friday	11:00	12:00	1:00	11-15,17-22	Durrell-3033	13-Mar-2000

The following is an example of the class timetable for accounting subject "ACC60100 Introduction to EU Taxation" – Summer 2020

Class	Type	Day name	Start	Finish	Duration	Weeks	Venue	Start Date
ACC60100	Lecture	Wednesday	17:00	20:00	3:00	1-6	Norris-NO225 (Dennis Norton Theatrette)	8-Jan-2000
ACC60100	Workshop 01	Tuesday	16:00	18:00	2:00	1-6	Durrell-2016	7-Jan-2000
ACC60100	Workshop 02	Thursday	17:00	19:00	2:00	1-6	Durrell-2019	9-Jan-2000
ACC60100	Workshop 03	Wednesday	14:00	16:00	2:00	1-6	Lawrence Bacow-404	8-Jan-2000

*(Hint: This data is incomplete **AND** not normalised!)*

Appendix C Example Allocations

The examples below are the kinds of allocations given to successful applicants

Example 1

Andrew applied once for the Autumn 2020 Semester and was allocated the following roles

Autumn 2020

MKT20300 Marketing for Enterprises
Workshop 01, Tuesday 16:00 Durrell-2019 Weeks 10-15, 17-22
Workshop 23, Monday 10:00 Durrell-3033 Weeks 10-15, 17-22
Marking 60 hours
ACC10020 Fundamentals of Financial Accounting
Tutorial 07, Tuesday 14:00 Durrell Weeks 10-15, 17-22
Marking 45 hours
Other Academic Activity 24 hours

Andrew was unsuccessful in MKT10100 and ACT10001

Example 2

Betty applied for roles in Autumn and again in Winter and was allocated the following roles:

Autumn 2020

ACC10020 Fundamentals of Financial Accounting
Tutorial 01 Monday 13:00 Durrell-2016 Weeks 10-15, 17-22
Tutorial 02 Monday 14:00 Durrell-3033 Weeks 10-15, 17-22
Marking 90 hours
FIN30110 Econometrics 3
Marking 30 hours

Winter 2020

ACC10030 Accounting Reports and Analysis
Practical 03 Thursday 18:00 Durrell-2019 Weeks 24-29
FIN40910 Financial Accounting Theory
Tutorial 18 Friday 08:00 Weeks 24-29

Example 3

Charles applied in the Summer and in Autumn and received the following allocation

Summer2020

ACC60100 Introduction to EU Taxation
Workshop 01 Tuesday 16:00 Durrell-3033 Weeks 1-6
Workshop 02 Thursday 17:00 Durrell 2019 Weeks 1-6
FIN20310 Cost Management Theory
Marking 135 hours

Charles did not obtain any allocation for Autumn

Appendix D: Email Templates

Below are some sample email templates for MKT30100 Marketing and Business Communication

MKT30100 Marketing and Business Communication – Application Received

FROM: mkt30100@titrs.edu.au
SUBJECT: Application Received
BODY:
Hello
Thank you for applying to tutor for MKT30100 Marketing and Business Communication in the Spring semester of 2020. Please ensure you have updated your availability, and have submitted a current resume and most recently completed Academic transcript.

We will notify you of your outcome via email. If we need to conduct an interview you will receive an email confirming an interview date and time.

Regards,
The MKT30100 team.

MKT30100 Marketing and Business Communication – Successful
FROM: mkt30100@titrs.edu.au
SUBJECT: Application Outcome MKT30100
BODY:
Hello
On behalf of the Faculty of Business, Marketing Department, I am pleased to inform you that you have been successful in your application to tutor for MKT30100 Marketing and Business Communication in the Spring semester of 2020 our first day of teaching is Monday 31st August 2020.

A formal contract offer will be sent shortly. If you have any questions about your contract please don't hesitate to contact me via phone (08 1234 5678) or email mkt30100@titrs.edu.au

Regards,
Dr Hilary Brookmyre
Subject Coordinator MKT30100

MKT30100 Marketing and Business Communication – Unsuccessful
FROM: mkt30100@titrs.edu.au
SUBJECT: Application Outcome MKT30100
BODY:
Hello,
Thank you for applying for a role as a tutor for MKT30100 in the Spring Semester. Unfortunately, you have been unsuccessful in this instance. Our next recruitment period will be Summer 2021.

We receive a large number of applicants however if you wish to speak to the subject coordinator please email mkt30100@titrs.edu.au for further information.

Your sincerely,
Dr Hilary Brookmyre
Subject Coordinator MKT30100

Assignment Submission:

ONE GROUP MEMBER should submit the assignment via the CANVAS LMS https://lms.unimelb.edu.au

GROUP AGREEMENT

- Submit your Group Agreement on or before **0600H 6pm Friday 21st August AEST** using the Group Agreement Submission link

ONE PDF document named as your Group number id (e.g. Group20.pdf) on or before

0900H (9 a.m.) 4th September 2020 AEST 2020 , containing:

- Legible image of your Conceptual Model in Chen notation
- Legible image of your Physical ER Model in Crows foot notation
- Assumptions (maximum 100 words) – your models should speak for themselves.
- Work break down per team member (measured 1-100% per team member)
- Student name and Student Number of all students

N.B. If you fail to submit legible models you will be penalised 10% of your total grade for this assignment.

ONE COPY of your team's final MySQL Workbench modelling file (with an .mwb extension) of the Physical ER model on or before **0900H (9 a.m.) 4th September 2020 AEST 2020**. Submit your .mwb file under the mwb Assignment 1 submission link.

Late Submissions

Assignments that are late without a formal granted deadline extension from the subject coordinator will attract a penalty of 10% for **each Academic Day** as per the School of Computing and Information Systems policy.

Subject Hurdle

To pass INFO90002 you must pass two hurdles. First you must obtain a mark of 15/30 or higher for both assignments (Assignment 1 20%, Assignment 2 10%) **AND** obtain a mark of 35/70 or higher for the end of semester assessment (exam).

Examples:

Alice's team obtains 18/20 for assignments 1, and Alice obtained 3/10 for Assignment 2, and Alice obtains 52/70 for the exam. Alice's final grade is 73/100 H2B. Alice passed the Assignment hurdle (21/30) and the exam hurdle (52/70).

Bob's team obtained 19/20 for the assignment 1. Bob obtained 9/10 for Assignment 2, and Bob obtained 33/70 for the exam. Bob's final grade is NH 49 (hurdle fail). Despite the fact that his overall grade is 61/100. Bob did not pass the exam hurdle (35/70).

Carol did not join a team for assignment 1 and obtained (0/20). Carol obtained 9/10 for Assignment 2 and obtained 63/70 for the exam. Carol fails the subject with a NH 49 (hurdle fail) despite a final grade of 72. Carol did not pass the Assignment hurdle (9/30)

Be sure you submit **all** assignments and attempt **every** question on the end of semester assessment to optimise your chance of passing INFO90002

Frequently Asked Questions

1. Do all images and links need to be stored in the database? A: YES. As a database designer you are required to store every attribute you think is required *inside the database.*
2. How do I submit a high resolution image of our conceptual and physical design? A: We recommend using an A3 page size in MySQL Workbench and exporting the image as a PDF
3. How do I join my four five different documents together? A: Save all your documents as PDFs and then merge each PDF into a master document. Another method is to upload all documents to a single Google doc and then download as a single PDF
4. How do I make MySQL workbench show PFK's (Primary Foreign Keys) A: You can't. This was a bug introduced into 5.7 of Workbench on Mac which now affects all releases of 8.0.x of MySQL Workbench. Markers are well aware of the issue and know what to look for. We have logged a bug with the development team at MySQL

Group Work Advice

Industry expects our Masters graduates to be able to work and communicate effectively in teams. This is why the University includes group work assessment in the majority of graduate classes.

When you form your team *immediately* decide the following:

1. How you will communicate to each other?
2. How often you will communicate?
3. How often you will meet as a group?
4. Agree on a communication escalation path

   E.G. WhatsApp – then if no response, SMS then if no response, email then if no response phone call, then if no response speak to the Subject Coordinator
5. Work out each team member's strengths and weaknesses. Assign tasks based on strengths.
6. Agree on a timetable or gant chart of tasks and deadline dates.
7. Pick someone to be the team leader/coordinator of your team. They will have responsibility to do their own work and follow up with other team members to make sure they are doing theirs.
8. Although unlikely work out how you will break a deadlock before you need to break a deadlock.
9. Teams from a variety of cultural, age, gender, socio-economic and educational backgrounds do better than homogenous teams. Mix it up to avoid group think and the same cognitive biases in team members.
10. Team Problems? Escalate to the Subject Coordinator EARLY so it doesn't mean anger, tears and regret later.
11. Failure to plan is a plan to fail. Don't fail. PLAN.

GOOD LUCK!

Example Rubrics – Physical E.R. Model

Looking at the model make an assessment about the attempt. This includes attribute & entity names. Over reliance of default values. Relationships and Relationship labels. Appropriate suitable PK choices. Clarity of thought and layout. Most importantly suitability to the case study itself. Check for signs of plagiarism (conscious and unconscious) and similarity to other student attempts and previous assignment solutions.	**COMPLEXITY TEST** 5. No unnecessary or superfluous relationships. Efficient design that is normalised with focus on efficient and effective implementation of the case study. Very good relationship labels. Nothing beyond 3NF 4. Not overly complex. Entity count is reasonable. Relationship Labels make sense. 3. Somewhat complex; Some excessive use of attributes; Modelled beyond the case study; A few superfluous entities, relationships, attributes 2. General impression is of over engineered solution going well beyond the reasonable scope of the case study. Every attribute that could be a lookup table (e.g. Suburb, Country) is a lookup table 1. Excessively overengineered, more representative of a model about to become an instance than the first cut of the clear text case study. Too many entities, too many attributes and relationships. 0. Excessively complex; excessive entities excessive attributes and relationships; Modelled the real world not to the case study; Plagiarism (COMMENT)	**SIMPLICITY TEST** 5. Not overly simplified. Very good normalisation. Efficient design that is normalised with a focus on effective and efficient performance 4. A good model. Some minor issues with normalisation. Mostly efficient and practical design, with perhaps a focus on the model's eventual implementation rather than the clear text case study. Better than below, Not as good as above. 3. Some denormalisation. Some reliance of default data types (e.g. varchar 45). A few missing key entities & attributes. Some use of assumptions to solve issues. 2. Over reliance on weak entities and surrogate keys. Focus is on query performance not modelling design 1. Overly denormalised; Too simplified; Missing relationships; Missing key entities & attributes. Over reliance on assumptions. 0. Plagiarism	**DATA TYPES** 4. The choice of data type has been considered for every attribute in the model and suitable for the context of the case study 3. Most data types have been considered but there are some errors and inconsistencies 2. ALL data types are default (INT for PK, VARCHAR(45) for strings - or other default (e.g varchar(40)) 1. Mismatch in PK-FK data type; Poor data type choices in more than half of the entities 0. Complete misunderstanding of datatype use. Plagiarism (COMMENT)	**ENTITIES** 8.An excellent map of entities that models the case study. Entity names are sensible (not too long, abbreviated names are understood) 7. A very good map of entities that models the case study; Minor issues with entity choices, naming, relationship normalisation logic. 1-3 minor issues with missing OR/AND superfluous entities 6 A good map of entities that models the case study. Some issues with entity choice, naming, relationship, minor denormalisation; More than 3 A few superfluous entities OR/AND few missing entities; 5. Entity count is too few; Entity count is too many; Model is workable; Some denormalisation; Poor entity naming choices across the majority of entities; Many superfluous entities OR/AND Many Missing entities 4. An acceptable attempt at modelling the entities; Denomarlised; Poor name choices; Lack of clarity; Difficulty in understanding the choices made; Entity abstraction from the case study is complex, difficult and lacking clarity of thought; Writing the SQL for these entities would be cumbersome. 3. Significant issues with entity modelling. Mostly denormalised; Poor name choices; Lack of coherency; Inconsistent application in choices; Entity abstraction is obtuse; Writing SQL would be cumbersome. 2. Unsatisfactory entity handling across the majority of the entities. Far too many; Far too few; Poor names (imagine writing the SQL for the entities: would the SQL be error prone and cumbersome?). Foreign Keys missing or wrong data types. (COMMENT) 1. Very Unsatisfactory. No demonstration of application of theory. Very poor choices for entities; Little evidence of normalisation; Cardinality is confused; Participation is misunderstood; No Primary Keys; Plagiarism (COMMENT)	**ATTRIBUTES** 4. Sensible attribute names. Easily understood by a manager. No ambiguity. Not too long in length. 3. Appropriate attribute names. Mostly easily understood by a manager. Minor issues with interpretation, clarity of purpose in name choice. 2. Satisfactory attribute names. Some issues with name choices. (e.g length), some issues with clarity of purpose in the attribute name choice Some very long attribute names. Some missing attributes 1. An unsuccess attempt. Attribute name choices are long; Attribute name choices are vague; Attribute names are ambiguous. Attribute names have spaces. Attribute names would be cumbersome to type in adhoc SQL. (COMMENT) 0. An unsatisfactory attempt. Plagiarism. (COMMENT)

Physical E.R. Model (continued)

CARDINALITY	**Participation**	**Weak Strong Entities**	**Primary Key**	**PFK/FK**	**Normalisation**	**Readability, Format**	**Originality / Similarity / Plagiarism** 1- 20 marks
8. All Business rules were met without any cardinality issues; All relationships between entities have the correct cardinality; 7. All Business rules were met without any cardinality issues; There are minor errors with relationships between cardinality (1-4); 6. The majority of business rules were met without cardinality issues. There are a few errors with relationships between cardinality (4-8); 5. Some business rules had cardinality issues. There are errors with relationships between cardinality (8 or more). 4. Satisfactory but not without issues with cardinality affecting the business rules and overall ER Model. Consistent but incorrect application of cardinality; 3. Significant cardinality errors; Inconsistent application of cardinality rules; Requirements of the case study would struggle to be met. 2. Unsatisfactory cardinality errors; No clear application of the requirements of cardinality in an ER Model (COMMENT) 1. Very unsatisfactory comprehension of the function of cardinality. Completely unworkable model as a result (COMMENT) 0. Plagiarism	5. Clear consistent demonstration of correct participation choices 4. Mostly correct participation choices; Some minor errors; 3. Consistent but incorrect participation choices; Inconsistent participation choices; Inappropriate participation choices ; Satisfactory is OK; Workable is OK; 2. Most participations are incorrect. EG forcing both sides to be mandatory when one must exist before the other. (COMMENT) 1. No clear demonstration of what is the appropriate participation choice (COMMENT) 0 Plagiarism	5. Excellent understanding and application of Weak/Strong Entities 4. Mostly correct understanding of when an entity should be weak. 3. Significant application of Weak Strong entity. Some entities have composite Primary keys which really don't need to have a composite primary key because of the Weak - Strong defined relationship 2. Majority of entities have been forced into Strong / Weak relationships which do not need to be so. Primary keys which really don't need to have a composite primary key because of the Weak - Strong defined relationship (**COMMENT**) 1. Unsatisfactory understanding of strong / weak entities. Plagiarism (COMMENT)	5. Excellent. Correct choice of Primary key. Correct choice of surrogate primary key; Correct choice of composite primary key; 4. Very Good. Some minor errors 3. Good. Some issues. Some unworkable choices, but the majority of PK choices is acceptable. **This grade if VARCHAR is used as a PK in isolation** 2. Significant issues with the choices of Primary Key. T**his grade if over zealous application of Weak Strong entities has not produced the key from the superkey candidates.** COMMENT 1. Unsuccessful attempt. Most PK choices are incorrect. Most PK choices are inappropriate COMMENT	5. Foreign Keys match their parent primary keys; No issues; PFK choices are correct; Approach has made decisions to avoid ambiguity 4. Foreign Keys match their parent primary keys; No issues; PFK choices are correct; Approach has some ambiguity in FK names when linked to PKs 3. Foreign Keys match their parent primary keys; Minor issues; PFK choices are mostly correct. Minor instances a surrogate key would be better. 2. Unsuccessful Attempt. Data type mismatch between FK and PK; PFK choices mostly incorrect. (COMMENT) 1. Unsatisfactory (COMMENT)	4. Normalised ER Model. Text Book. 3. Mostly normalised. Some denormalisation but case study requirements are met. 2. A good first attempt 1. Overtly denormalised. Most relations do not meet 3NF 0. Significant errors; Significant denormalisation; COMMENT	1. I can read it. 0. I had to open the mwb file. Unreadable; crowded; poor image; Incomplete;	COMMENT **REPORT**

Chen Conceptual models

Entities	**Attributes**	**Multivalued/Composite/ Deived Attributes**	**Relationships**	**Key Constraints**	**Participation Constraints**	**Clarity / Readability**
10: All Entities are present and clearly identified as weak or normal **8**: All Entities are present and most are correct few extra / missing **6**: Some missing / additional entities / **5**: incorrect weak or normal - consistently incorrect identification of weak/normal entities; Satisfactory use of entities **4**: Many missing / Many additional entities / incorrect weak or normal / inconsistencies in use of Chen notation **2**: Unsatisfactory attempt (PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY) 0: No submission No attempt; Plagiarism	10: Attributes are accurately diagrammed and use the correct Chen notation 8 : Attributes are accurately diagrammed and use the correct Chen notation Minor issues 6: Attributed attributes in case study are diagrammed AND Most attributes use the correct Chen attribute type 4: Several missing or additional attributes, incorrect Chen notation; Consistency in incorrect Chen notation 3: Significant missing / Significant additional attributes, M:M resolved; Inconsistency in use of Chen notation 1: Unsatisfactory. No demonstrated comprehension of Chen notation use and application. Plagiarism (COMMENT)	2: Multivalued, composite and derived attributes used correctly 1 : Some errors in the use of multivalued, composite and derived attributes 0: Unsatisfactory attempt. Inconsistent use of Chen notation (demonstrated by incorrect use making no sense when interpreted) Plagiarism	5: ALL Relationships are correctly used and labelled 4: Most relationships are correctly used, minor errors 3: Some errors in relationships. 2: Incorrect use of relationships; Consistent incorrect use of relationships 1: Significant errors; 0: Major misunderstanding of the idea of relationships, or no attempt. Plagiarism	10: Key constraints for all relationships and are correctly documented in Chen Notation 8: Mostly correct Key constraints 6: Good attempt at Key constraints and/or consistently incorrect use of Chen notation 5: Satisfactory. 3: Significant errors in Key Constraint choices; Inconsistent application of Key constraints 1: Hybrid notation / no clear demonstration of understanding of key constraints using Chen notation. Plagiarism	8: Participation constraints for all relationships and are correctly documented in Chen Notation. 7: Mostly correct Participation constraints and/or consistently incorrect use of Chen notation 5: Good attempt at Participation constraints. A few minor or moderate errors in application and comprehension 4: Satisfactory: Some mismatch in total/partial participation; Model becoming unworkable; 3: Significant errors in Participation Constraint choices; Consistent incorrect choice of participation constraints 2: Hybrid notation / Inconsistent notation demonstrating lack of comprehension. 1: Unsatisfactory. Plagiarism	5: Excellent. Very legible easy to read 4. Very Good. Legible easy to read. Minor issues 3. Good. Legible, some layout / readability issues 2. Crowded. Messy. Some difficulty in reading and interpreting the Chen model 1. Unsatisfactory. Plagiarism

N.B.:Each Assessment rubric is designed specifically to the needs of the case study. Use this as guidance, not writ law.

Revisions

Date	Version	
12-Aug-2000	2.0	G.A. version released to all students
25-Aug-2000	2.0a	Fixed Appendix B Tutorial Names and added the word DUE to the assessment due date. All changes in Dark Blue
28-Aug-2000	2.0b	Extended the deadline date to 9.00 a.m. AEST 9th September 2020. All changes in Emerald Green