

PROJECT RUBRIC 2023/2024 October Semester						
Group:		Student Name:		Class:	Date:	
				PE0		
Mid-Term Project Assessment	Scoring Criteria Category (Max marks)	Exemplary	Good	Average	Pass	Fail
	Final Project Brief (10 marks) (Group)	1) The project brief is exceptionally comprehensive, clear, and well-structured, leaving no room for ambiguity. 2) The document presents a compelling and detailed project narrative, including objectives, scope, and deliverables. 3) Work is well-defined and divided evenly amongst team members. 4) Planning is comprehensive, and the tasks are well-defined.	1) The project brief is well-structured, providing clear and detailed project information. 2) The project narrative effectively outlines the project's objectives, scope, and deliverables. 3) Work is defined and divided evenly amongst team members. 4) Planning is well-considered, and the tasks are adequately defined.	1) The project brief is adequately structured but may lack some clarity or detail. 2) The project narrative outlines objectives, scope, and deliverables reasonably well. 3) Work division shows a small degree of bias amongst team members. 4) Planning is present but may require further elaboration, and the tasks are defined.	1) The project brief is somewhat disorganized and may lack clarity in some areas. 2) The project narrative outlines objectives and scope but may be less detailed. 3) Work division shows bias amongst team members. 4) Planning is basic, and the list of tasks are not well-defined.	1) The project brief is disorganized, incomplete, or severely lacking in clarity. 2) The project narrative is insufficient or missing key elements like objectives, scope, or deliverables. 3) No work division shows amongst team members. 4) Planning is missing or inadequate. The tasks are not defined.
	Scoring Criteria Category (Max marks)	Exemplary	Good	Average	Pass	Fail
	Entity Relationship Diagram (ERD) (5 marks) (Group)	1) ERD has considered all the project requirements and design.	1) ERD has considered most of the project requirements and design.	1) ERD has considered more than half of the project requirements and design.	1) ERD has considered only half of the project requirements and design.	1) ERD has considered less than half of the project requirements and design.
	Scoring Criteria Category (Max marks)	Exemplary	Good	Average	Pass	Fail
	Basic Full-Stack Application (5 marks) (Group)	1) The application meets the all the requirements for basic full-stack application with complete testing. 2) Set up version control for all team members and committed the initial project source.	1) The application meets the all the requirements for basic full-stack application. 2) Set up version control for all team members and committed the initial project source.	1) The application meets the basic requirements but requires minor improvement. 2) Set up version control for all team members and committed the initial project source.	1) The application meets the basic requirements but requires substantial improvement. 2) Set up version control for only one team member and committed the initial project source.	1) The application does not meet the required standards for a basic full-stack application. 2) Did not set up version control or did not commit the initial project source
	Scoring Criteria Category (Max marks)	Exemplary	Good	Average	Pass	Fail

Scoring Criteria		Exemplary	Good	Average	Pass	Fail
Category (Max marks)						
Project Presentation & Submission	Oral Presentation (10 marks) (Individual)	1) The presentation is outstanding in every aspect, demonstrating exceptional communication skills. 2) It is engaging, clear, and captivating, maintaining the audience's full attention. 3) Content is thorough, well-structured, and expertly delivered, showcasing deep knowledge of the topic. 4) Answers are articulate, well-structured, and demonstrate critical thinking and problem-solving skills.	1) The presentation is of high quality, demonstrating strong communication skills. 2) It is clear and effectively engages the audience for the most part. 3) Content is well-structured and presented with confidence, showing a good understanding of the topic. 4) Answers are clear, well-organized, and reflect critical thinking.	1) The presentation is decent, with communication skills that are satisfactory. 2) It conveys the main points but may lack some clarity and engagement at times. 3) Content is adequately structured, covering key aspects of the topic. 4) Answers are generally clear but may lack some depth or detail in places.	1) The presentation is basic, with communication skills that require improvement. 2) It conveys fundamental points but may lack clarity, engagement, and depth. 3) Content is minimally structured and may lack completeness. 4) Answers may lack clarity, depth, or detail, with room for improvement.	1) The presentation is ineffective, with communication skills that need substantial development. 2) It lacks clarity, engagement, and a coherent structure. 3) Content is underdeveloped or missing key elements. 4) Answers may be unclear, vague, or unrelated to the questions asked.
	Demonstration Technique (10 marks) (Individual)	1) The demonstration is outstanding in every aspect, showcasing exceptional development and presentation skills. 2) The software is fully functional, free from critical issues, and exceeds project requirements. 3) The demonstration is exemplary, leaving a lasting positive impression and exemplifying masterful time management.	1) The demonstration is of high quality, demonstrating strong development and presentation skills. 2) The software is functional with minor issues, and it meets project requirements effectively. 3) The demonstration is good, demonstrating competence and capability in time management.	1) The demonstration is decent, showing satisfactory development and presentation skills. 2) The software is somewhat functional but may have noticeable issues or limitations. 3) The demonstration is acceptable, indicating a basic level of preparedness and time management.	1) The demonstration is basic and may require further development. 2) The software may have noticeable functional issues or limitations. 3) The demonstration needs notable improvement in time management and overall effectiveness.	1) The demonstration is ineffective, with significant functional issues or limitations. 2) The software is incomplete or not functional. 3) The performance in the timed demonstration is ineffective and falls short of expectations.

Scoring Criteria		Exemplary	Good	Average	Pass	Fail
Category (Max marks)						
Project Presentation & Submission	Project Report (10 marks) (Group)	1) The project report is exceptionally well-structured, comprehensive, and exemplifies outstanding research and writing skills. 2) It is impeccably organized, showcasing a deep understanding of the project. 3) The report covers all aspects of the project in detail and exceeds expectations. 4) The writing is clear, concise, and engaging, demonstrating excellent communication and presentation. 5) Diagrams are meticulously crafted, clear, and visually appealing, displaying a deep understanding of the subject matter.	1) The project report is of high quality, well-structured, and effectively demonstrates strong research and writing skills. 2) It is well-organized, showcasing a good understanding of the subject matter. 3) The report covers the project comprehensively and meets expectations. 4) The writing is clear and engaging, effectively communicating the project's details. 5) Diagrams are well-crafted, clear, and appropriately complement the content, demonstrating a strong understanding of the subject matter.	1) The project report is decent, with satisfactory structure and research and writing skills. 2) It is adequately organized but may lack some clarity and depth. 3) The report provides an acceptable overview of the project's aspects. 4) The writing is generally clear but may need more depth and engagement. 5) Diagrams are adequately crafted, though they may lack some clarity or detail.	1) The project report is basic and may require further development in terms of structure and research and writing skills. 2) It may lack clarity, depth, and effective organization. 3) The report covers the project in a basic manner. 4) The writing is basic and may lack clarity and engagement. 5) Diagrams may lack clarity and detail, impacting their ability to enhance understanding.	1) The project report is ineffective, with significant limitations in structure, research, and writing skills. 2) It may lack clarity, coherence, and organization. 3) The report provides minimal or irrelevant information about the project. 4) The writing is poor, and there is a lack of clarity and engagement. 5) Diagrams may be unclear, irrelevant, or disorganized.
	Application Layer (10 marks) (Group)	1) Employ the Model-View-Controller framework in the application. 2) Clearly demonstrates mastery of custom RESTful APIs	1) Employ the Model-View-Controller framework in the application. 2) Clearly demonstrates mastery of auto-generated RESTful APIs.	1) Employ the Model-View-Controller framework in the application. 2) Demonstrates understanding of auto-generated RESTful APIs.	1) Employ the Model-View-Controller framework in the application partially. 2) Demonstrates basic understanding of RESTful APIs.	1) Does not make use of the Model-View-Controller framework in the application. 2) Does not demonstrate basic understanding of RESTful APIs.

Project Presentation & Submission	Scoring Criteria	Exemplary	Good	Average	Pass	Fail
	Category (Max marks)					
	Front-End (20 marks) (Individual)	1) The front-end application is exceptionally well-designed, showcasing mastery of front-end technologies and user experience principles. 2) It offers an outstanding user interface, exceptional performance, and seamless navigation. 3) The code is impeccably clean, well-organized, and thoroughly documented. 4) Comprehensive testing and robust usability features like error handling are in place. 5) The application sets a high standard for front-end development, incorporating innovative features and best practices.	1) The front-end application is well-designed, effectively employing front-end technologies to create a strong user experience. 2) It provides a solid user interface, good performance, and easy navigation. 3) The code is well-organized and adequately documented. 4) Testing and usability features like error handling are implemented effectively. 5) The application demonstrates a good understanding of front-end development principles.	1) The front-end application is functional but may lack some refinements in design and user experience. 2) It performs adequately but may have room for improvement. 3) The code is moderately organized, and documentation is sufficient but may be improved. 4) Basic testing and usability features are in place. 5) The application meets the minimum standards for front-end development.	1) The front-end application is basic and may have significant design and functionality issues. 2) Performance may be suboptimal. 3) The code is minimally organized and lacks thorough documentation. 4) Limited testing and usability features are implemented. 5) The application meets the basic requirements but requires substantial improvement.	1) The front-end application is non-functional or severely flawed in design, functionality, or performance. 2) The code is disorganized and poorly documented. 3) Minimal or no testing and usability features are in place. 4) The application does not meet the required standards for a front-end application.

Project Presentation & Submission	Scoring Criteria	Exemplary	Good	Average	Pass	Fail
	Category (Max marks)					
	Back-End (20 marks) (Individual)	1) The back-end application is exceptionally well-architected and demonstrates mastery of back-end technologies and best practices. 2) The database has been developed and structured in accordance with its intended or final design specifications. 3) The code is impeccably organized, well-documented, and follows industry standards. 4) Comprehensive testing and realistic scenario testing are in place.	1) The back-end application is well-architected and effectively employs back-end technologies to provide data relevance and functionality. 2) The database has been developed and structured very close to its intended or final design specifications. 3) The code is well-organized, adequately documented, and adheres to coding standards. 4) Testing and functional testing are implemented effectively.	1) The back-end database implementation is functional but may lack some refinements in design and data relevance. 2) The database has been developed and structured slightly differs from its intended or final design specifications. 3) The database schema is moderately structured, and documentation is sufficient but may be improved. 4) The database implementation meets the minimum standards for database management.	1) The back-end database implementation is basic and may have significant design or data relevance issues. 2) The database has been developed and structured differently from its intended or final design specifications with room for improvement. 3) The database schema is minimally structured and lacks thorough documentation. 4) The database implementation meets the basic requirements but requires substantial improvement.	1) The back-end database implementation is non-functional or severely flawed in design, data relevance, or data integrity. 2) The database schema is disorganized and poorly documented. 3) The implementation does not meet the required standards for a back-end database.

Comments	