

| Criterion | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2-1 |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Functionality, reliability, design and usability.</p> <p>10 + 5 + 5 = 20.</p> | <p>The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 7 level grade in the specification. This includes a React site catering to each of the API endpoints and both graph and mapping components.</p> <p>The application is robust and executes without noticeable error and handles service failures and errors gracefully.</p> <p>The application is clean and uncluttered, and the principal use cases are a natural fit for the user interface, allowing execution without undue effort or confusion.</p> | <p>The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 6 level grade in the specification. This includes a React site catering to each of the API endpoints and at least one of the graph and mapping components.</p> <p>The application is robust and executes without noticeable error and handles gracefully most service failures.</p> <p>The application is clean and generally uncluttered, and the principal use cases are readily executed, though there may be some clumsiness in the workflow.</p> | <p>The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 5 level grade in the specification. This includes a React site catering to each of the API endpoints .</p> <p>The application is robust and executes with only occasional errors and handles gracefully most service failures.</p> <p>The application is clean and generally uncluttered, and the principal use cases are reasonably easily executed, though there are some questionable choices in the design.</p> | <p>The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 4 level grade in the specification. This includes an html-based site catering to each of the API endpoints .</p> <p>The application basically works, but the robustness is questionable and there are obvious errors and service failures are not handled well.</p> <p>The application is somewhat clean and uncluttered, but overall the design is clumsy and doesn't operate very well.</p> | <p>The client side application implements some of the functionality listed as necessary for a 4 level grade, but does not consume all of the services or some are poorly implemented.</p> <p>The application basically works, but there are numerous errors and failures.</p> <p>The application is poorly laid out, but the basic functionality remains usable.</p> | <p>The application does not meet the specification or is fundamentally flawed in its use of the API and its services.</p> <p>The application is markedly incomplete and results in numerous errors.</p> <p>Layout is poor and usability very weak.</p> |
| Marks (20) | | | | | | |

Some general comments: the grade level for functionality will generally be reduced by one or two grade levels if API endpoints are omitted or poorly implemented. Note that a grade level of 5 or above cannot be achieved if the authenticated search functionality is not implemented successfully. This requires that the registration and login functionality be completed and working.

Marks will be awarded out of 40 and then reduced to 20, being combined with the 10 marks for the checkpoint demo to yield a score out of 30. This will be combined with the 30% from the server side component to yield the 60% mark for the assignment.

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Development Process & Code Quality 10 marks | The application shows clear evidence of a professional approach to development, with a coherent modular structure and code quality at a near professional level. | The application shows good evidence of a professional approach to development, with a coherent modular structure and code quality at a near professional level, apart from some minor variations. | The application shows some evidence of a professional approach to development, with a reasonably coherent modular structure and competent, but not always professional level code quality. | The application shows limited evidence of a professional approach to development, with ad hoc or unclear organisation of the application and variable levels of code quality. | Application development has been ad hoc and little more than hacking, with no obvious organisation. Code exhibits numerous defects when compared to the standard expected. | Application development is deeply flawed, with little structure and poor code quality. |
| Marks (10) | | | | | | |
| Report and User Guide 10 marks | The report is thoroughly professional and addresses each of the listed requirements in detail and with only occasional errors of grammar or structure. | The report is thoroughly professional and addresses each of the listed requirements in detail and with some more frequent errors in grammar or structure. | The report is professional but lacks some detail in a small number of the listed requirements. There may be occasional errors of grammar or structure. | The report is adequate, but the coverage is deficient in a number of the listed requirements. Grammar and structure may be somewhat variable, but are overall ok. | The report is somewhat adequate, but the coverage is deficient in many of the listed requirements. Grammar and structure are of variable quality. | The report is flawed and doesn't meet the requirements. There may be whole sections missing or poorly covered. There is no coherent professional report structure as required |
| Marks (10) | | | | | | |
| TOTAL (40) | | | | | | |