

Criterion	7	6	5	4	3	2-1
<p>API Endpoint functionality, error responses and application reliability.</p> <p>20 + 10 = 30 marks</p>	<p>The server successfully implements all of the API endpoints according to their Swagger doc specifications, including authenticated search and multiple term filtering. The Swagger docs are complete and successfully served.</p> <p>The application is robust and executes without noticeable error and handles service failures and errors gracefully. Error conditions are returned in accordance with the API spec.</p>	<p>The server supports all of the API endpoints but there are some limitations in the implementation. The Swagger docs are complete and successfully served. [See discussion of 6-7 levels in the server side spec document.]</p> <p>The application is robust and executes without noticeable error and handles service failures and errors gracefully. Error conditions are mostly returned in accordance with the API spec.</p>	<p>The server supports all of the API endpoints to 5 level – including authenticated search, though there may be limitations in the filtering. Swagger docs are served but may not be complete.</p> <p>The application is mostly robust and usually executes without error. Service failures and errors are handled adequately. Error conditions are often not in accordance with the API spec.</p>	<p>The server supports basic API functionality to 4 level, but may not include search filters or authenticated routes. [See the spec for full details]. Swagger docs may not have been attempted or may be poorly implemented.</p> <p>The application basically works, but the robustness is questionable and there are obvious errors and service failures are not handled well. Error conditions are often not in accordance with the API spec.</p>	<p>A basic express app with some functioning routes is presented, but the API is markedly incomplete or poorly implemented.</p> <p>The application basically works, but there are numerous errors and failures. The API error responses are not to specification.</p>	<p>The server does not meet the specification or is fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>The application is markedly incomplete and results in numerous errors.</p>
<p>Application Architecture, Security and Logging</p> <p>10 marks</p>	<p>The application architecture is professional and uncluttered. The routes are well-organised and handled by appropriate routers. There is good use of middleware for DB connectivity, logging and security. The risk of SQL Injection attacks is mitigated using standard methods.</p>	<p>The application architecture is reasonably professional and uncluttered. The routes are well-organised and routers are usually organised appropriately. There is some use of middleware for DB connectivity, logging and security, but there may be some variations in the approach. The risk of SQL Injection attacks is mitigated using standard methods.</p>	<p>The application architecture is good but some aspects are awkward, with some routes not handled especially well, and routers not split appropriately. There is some use of middleware, but this is not as clearly thought out as it needs to be. The risk of SQL Injection attacks is mitigated using standard methods.</p>	<p>The application architecture is basically sound but the route organisation is very clumsy in parts, and there is too much functionality handled at the application level or in large routers. There is limited use of middleware. The risk of SQL Injection attacks is mitigated but this is cursory.</p>	<p>The application architecture is not well chosen, the routes are not well organised and there is little or no use of middleware. There is no attention given to mitigating SQL injection.</p>	<p>The application architecture is flawed and there is no use of middleware and no attempt to mitigate the risks from SQL injection.</p>
(40 Marks)						

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.
(10 Marks)						
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
(10 Marks)						
TOTAL (60)						

Note: Marks will be awarded out of 60 and then reduced to 30, being combined with the 10 marks for the checkpoint demo and 20 marks from the client side component to yield the 60% mark for the assignment.