|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Marks | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2/1 |
| **Overall Functionality**  **(30 marks)**  **Application performance and balance between client and server queries.**  **(10 marks)**  **Application Robustness**  **(10 marks)**  **Application UI Design. Note that there is no direct assessment of the quality of the graphic design – this is purely based on function and usability.**  **(20 marks)** | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 6/7 level grade, and is thoroughly professional in its implementation and performance.  The application presents data quickly and without any noticeable latency as queries are processed. Client-side filtering is complementary to the API endpoints.  The application is robust, without any noticeable errors and handles service failures and errors gracefully.  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. Menus and other control structures are well thought out and the user has little trouble navigating the site. | 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.  The application is robust and executes without noticeable error and handles gracefully most service failures.  The application is clean and generally uncluttered, and the principal use cases are readily executed, though there may be some clumsiness in the workflow. | 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 .  The application is robust and executes with only occasional errors and handles gracefully most service failures.  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. | 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 .  The application basically works, but the robustness is questionable and there are obvious errors and service failures are not handled well.  The application is somewhat clean and uncluttered, but overall the design is clumsy and doesn’t operate very well. | 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.  The application basically works, but there are numerous errors and failures.  The application is poorly laid out, but the basic functionality remains usable. | The application does not meet the specification or is fundamentally flawed in its use of the API and its services.  The application is markedly incomplete and results in numerous errors.  Layout is poor and usability very weak. | | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 6/7 level grade, and is mostly professional in its implementation and performance. Some high level features may have minor issues or limitations.  The application presents data quickly as queries are processed, though occasional latency may be observed. Client-side filtering is generally complementary to the API endpoints.  The application is robust and executes without noticeable errors and handles gracefully most service failures.  The application is clean and generally uncluttered, and the principal use cases are readily executed, though there may be some clumsiness in the workflow. Menus and other control structures are well thought out and the user generally has little trouble navigating the site. | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 5 level grade. These are implemented professionally. Some 6/7 level features may be attempted but these are not implemented to the standard required for the next grade level.  The application presents data reasonably quickly as queries are processed. However, there may be some noticeable latency or an inappropriate division between client and server processing.  The application is robust and  executes with only occasional errors and handles gracefully most service failures.  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. Menus and other control structures are reasonably well thought out, but there may be some issue. Navigation may not always be straightforward. | The client side application implements all of the functionality listed as necessary for a 4 level grade in the specification. These are implemented to a good standard, but there may be some minor issues.  The application just uses the API endpoints or there are significant performance issues.  The application basically works, but the robustness is questionable and there are obvious errors and service failures are not handled well.  The application is somewhat clean and uncluttered, but overall the design is clumsy and doesn’t operate very well. Menus and other control structures are basically sensible but there may be poor choices. Navigation may present some problems. . | 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.  The application doesn’t hit all the endpoints.  The application basically works, but there are numerous errors and failures.  The application is poorly laid out, but the basic functionality remains usable. Navigation is difficult. | The application does not meet the specification or is fundamentally flawed in its use of the API and its services.  The application is markedly incomplete and performance is poor.  The application is markedly incomplete and results in numerous errors.  Layout is poor and usability very weak. The site is barely usable. |
| **Marks (70)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Development and 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. |
| **Report and Reflections**  **(20 marks)** | The report is thoroughly professional and addresses each of the listed requirements in detail and with only occasional errors of grammar or structure. There are good critical reflections on the UI design and the technical components of the application. | The report is thoroughly professional and addresses each of the listed requirements in detail and with some more frequent errors in grammar or structure. There are good critical reflections on the UI design and the technical components of the application. | 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. Reflections on the application design and usability and the technical description are more limited. | 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. Reflections on the application design and usability and the technical description are more limited or missing. | The report is somewhat adequate, but the coverage is deficient in many of the listed requirements. Grammar and structure are of variable quality. Key reflections and descriptions are missing. | 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 (30)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall Marks (100)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |