ST207 DATABASES (AT2024) – ASSIGNMENT 1 - MARKING CRITERIA

Question	Fail	Pass	Merit	Distinction	Weight
1	Missing entities, attributes, relationships and/or cardinalities. Missing explanations in the report. Lack of diagram deliverables.	Correct number of entities, attributes, relationships and/or cardinalities, with minor errors related to attribute types, relationship cardinalities or other aspects not mapped from the given context with moderated influence in the resulting diagram. Satisfactory explanation in the report, with minor points to clarify. Diagram deliverables ok.	Correct number of entities, attributes, relationships and/or cardinalities, with no errors. Correct use of specialisations (if any). Correct extensions/modifications from the given context. Consistent and clear explanation in the report, with minor points to clarify. Diagram deliverables ok.	Correct number of entities, attributes, relationships and/or cardinalities, with no errors. Correct use of specialisations (if any). Correct extensions/modifications from the given context with direct influence on the structure and results of SQL queries. Consistent and clear explanation in the report, with no points to clarify. Diagram deliverables ok.	20
2	Missing tables, attributes (and data types), primary/foreign keys. Relational model does not match the conceptual model. Missing explanations in the report. Lack of diagram deliverables.	Correct number of tables, attributes (and data types) and primary/foreign keys, with minor errors related to attributes, data types, relationship cardinalities (foreign keys) or other aspects not mapped from the conceptual model with moderated influence in the resulting diagram. Satisfactory explanation in the report, with minor points to clarify. Diagram deliverables ok.	Correct number of tables, attributes (and data types) and primary/foreign keys, with no errors. Correct mapping of specialisations (if any). Correct use of views. Consistent and clear explanation in the report, with minor points to clarify. Diagram deliverables ok.	Correct number of tables, attributes (and data types) and primary/foreign keys, with no errors. Correct mapping of specialisations (if any). Correct use of views with direct influence on the structure and results of SQL queries. No redundant entities and/or attributes. Consistent and clear explanation in the report, with no points to clarify. Diagram deliverables ok.	15
3	Missing or faulty DDL commands. Missing foreign keys. Views (if any) not correctly created. Missing explanations in the report. Lack of DDL commands in the code.	Correct DDL commands, with minor errors that do not affect the database creation (for instance, wrong data types). All relationships properly created. Views (if any) created, with minor corrections. Satisfactory explanation in the report. Code submitted.	Correct DDL commands, with no errors. All relationships properly created. Views (if any) created, with no errors. Consistent and clear explanation in the report. Code submitted.	Correct DDL commands, with no errors. All relationships properly created. Views (if any) created, with no errors, and influencing the structure of SQL queries (for instance, less tables/data to be joined). No redundant data. Consistent and clear explanation in the report. Code submitted.	5

4	Lack of sufficient data. Unclear explanation about data sources and/or data generation process. No code and/or database file submitted.	Data is compatible with the model, with minor points to adjust (for instance, adding more instances to a given table). Good explanation of data sources (if any), with minor points for improvement (for instance, adding other data sources to complement the data). Good explanation of data generation process but lack of consistency check (for instance, foreign key constraints). Satisfactory explanation in the report. Code and/or database file submitted.	Good choice of data sources, compatible with the model, with no adjustments (i.e., enough data to address all SQL queries). Good explanation of data generation process, with minor corrections related to consistency checks. Consistent and clear explanation in the report. Code and/or database file submitted.	Excellent choice of data sources, compatible with the model and approximating a real scenario, with no adjustments (i.e., enough and diversified data to address all SQL queries). Good explanation of data generation process, along with consistency checks, with no points for improvement. Consistent and clear explanation in the report. Code and/or database file submitted.	5
5.1 to 5.4	Lack of solution. Faulty/partial solution. Lack of results (no outputs shown in the report). No explanation in the report. No code submitted.	Good solution based on standard SQL constructs, with minor points for improvement and/or errors. Good results but with room for improvement (for instance, adding more instances to make results more relevant/closer to a real scenario). Satisfactory explanation in the report. Code submitted.	Good solution based on complex SQL constructs, with minor points for improvement and no errors. Good use of join, subqueries, aggregation, UDFs and window functions (some redundancy of code is tolerated). Good results with no need for improvement. Consistent and clear explanation in the report. Code submitted.	Excellent use of complex SQL constructs, with effective exploration of join, subqueries, aggregation, UDFs and window functions, with no code redundancy (i.e., unnecessary statements). Excellent results, showing diversity and covering real scenarios. Consistent and clear explanation in the report. Code submitted.	10 each
6	Lack of solution. Faulty/partial solution. Lack of results (no outputs shown in the report). No explanation in the report. No code submitted.	Good choice of trigger scenario with respective solution based on standard SQL constructs, with minor points for improvement and/or errors. Good results but with room for improvement (for instance, improving the trigger's fire condition, testing alternative inputs). Satisfactory explanation in the report. Code submitted.	Good choice of trigger scenario with respective solution based on complex SQL constructs, with minor points for improvement and no errors. Good results for both cases (pass/fire the trigger) with minor points for improvement. Consistent and clear explanation in the report. Code submitted.	Excellent choice of trigger scenario (i.e., most challenging scenario for the proposed database) with respective solution based on complex SQL constructs, with no improvements or errors. Good results for both cases (pass/fire the trigger) with no need for improvement. Consistent and	10

				clear explanation in the report. Code submitted.	
Presentation	Poor presentation. Messy and/or missing sections in the report. Messy and/or non-documented code. No clear figures and/or explanations. Report does not respect page limit. Any missing deliverables.	Good report with the necessary sections, with minor points for improvement. Clear figures and explanations, with minor points for improvements. No missing deliverables.	Well-structured report with the necessary sections, with no points for improvement. Clear figures and explanations, with no improvements. No missing deliverables.	Well-structured report with the necessary sections, with no points for improvement. Clear figures and sound explanations, with no improvements and closer to real scenarios. No missing deliverables.	5

Observation: as per School and course-specific policy, you may acknowledge the use of any generative AI tool in any part of your summative work. You may note that marks can be deducted if no acknowledgement is made and/or a substantial part of your work (especially coding) is done by these tools. You may use these tools literally as a "co-pilot" to help you prototype your database models, generate synthetic data, and/or structure your SQL queries, but the final results must be your own, validated work.