## ASSESSMENT RUBRIC [Team 9]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **MARKS** | | | | | |
| **User Interface Design (50%)** | **16-20** | **13-15** | **10-12** | **8-9** | **0-7** | **Comments** |
| Excellent in the areas of the scope. All areas are at least good. May be outstanding is some areas and good in others and hence is on balance excellent. Good or above in all areas. Likely to contain minor errors, omissions or additions which prevent the user interface design from being outstanding.  Overall an excellent user interface design. | Good in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the user interface design is outstanding or excellent in some areas and satisfactory in others but on balance is good. Satisfactory or above in all areas. Likely to contain a small number of errors, omissions or additions which prevent the user interface design from being excellent. Overall a good user interface design. | Satisfactory in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the user interface design is good or above in some areas and satisfactory in others. Weak in no more than two areas. Likely to contain a number of errors, omissions or additions which prevent the user interface design from being good.  Overall satisfactory. | Weak in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the user interface design is satisfactory or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others. Likely to be weak in more than three areas. It might be unsatisfactory in one area but no more. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings that prevent the user interface design from being satisfactory. Overall poor. | An unsatisfactory diagram in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the user interface design is weak or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others.  Unsatisfactory in two or more areas. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings that prevent the user manual from being weak. May not be recognizable as a user interface design, and might have major errors in content or a  combination of the two. |  |
|  | **16-20** | **13-15** | **10-12** | **8-9** | **0-7** | **Comments** |
| **Implementation (50%)** | Excellent in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency and syntax. Correct  following of object- oriented concepts. | Good in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency and syntax. It is  possible that the application is | Satisfactory in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency and syntax. It is  possible that the application is good | Weak in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency and syntax. It is  possible that the application is | Unsatisfactory in the implementation, comments, indentation, consistency and  syntax. It is possible that the |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The work shows particular insight or originality in its approach. Excellent functionalities which identify the underlying principles behind the problem. All areas are at least good. May be outstanding is some areas and good in others and hence is on balance excellent. Good or above in all areas. Likely to contain minor errors, omissions or additions which prevent the implementation from being outstanding.  Overall an excellent implementation. | outstanding or excellent in some areas and satisfactory in others but on balance is good. Satisfactory or above in all areas. Likely to contain a small number of errors, omissions or additions which prevent the implementation from being excellent. Overall a good implementation. | or above in some areas and satisfactory in others. Likely to be weak in no more than two areas.  Likely to contain a number of errors, omissions or additions which prevent the implementation from being good. Overall a satisfactory implementation. | satisfactory or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others. Likely to be weak in more than three areas. It might be unsatisfactory in one area but no more. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings that prevent the implementation from being satisfactory. Still recognizable as an object-oriented application of the problem in focus. Overall poor but satisfactory. | application is weak or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others.  Unsatisfactory in two or more areas. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings that prevent the implementation from being weak. May not be recognizable as an object-oriented application, and might have major errors in implementation or a combination of the two. |  |
| **Video (50%)** | **16-20** | **13-15** | **10-12** | **8-9** | **0-7** | **Comments** |
|  | Excellent in the areas of the scope. All areas are at least good. May be outstanding is some areas and good in others and hence is on balance excellent. Good or above in all areas. Likely to contain minor errors, omissions or  additions which | Good in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the video is outstanding or excellent in some areas and satisfactory in others but on balance is good.  Satisfactory or above in all areas. Likely to contain a  small number of | Satisfactory in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the video is good or above in some areas and satisfactory in others. Weak in no more than two areas. Likely to contain a number of errors, omissions  or additions which | Weak in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the video is satisfactory or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others. Likely to be weak in more than three areas. It might be unsatisfactory in  one area but no | Unsatisfactory in the areas of the scope. It is possible that the video is weak or above in some areas and unsatisfactory in others.  Unsatisfactory in two or more areas. Likely to contain errors, omissions,  additions, or |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | prevent the video from being outstanding. Overall an excellent video. | errors, omissions or additions which prevent the video from being excellent. Overall a good video. | prevent the video from being good. Overall satisfactory. | more. Likely to contain errors, omissions, additions, or misunderstandings which prevent the video from being satisfactory. Overall poor. | misunderstandings which prevent the video from being weak. May not be recognisable as a video, might have majors errors in content or a combination of the two. |  |
| **Techniques &**  **Skills (50%)** | **16-20** | **13-15** | **10-12** | **8-9** | **0-7** | **Comments** |
|  | Demostrates initiative that exceeds required techniques/skills.  Appropriate materials were selected and creatively modified in ways that made them even better. | Consistently demonstrates all designated techniques/skills, rarely needs prompting.  Appropriate materials were selected and there was an attempt at creative modification to  make them even better. | Demonstrates all designated techniques/skills, occasionally needs prompting.  Appropriate materials were selected and there was an attempt at moderate modification. | Demonstrates most designed techniques/skills, frequently needs prompting.  Appropriate materials were selected and there was an attempt at minor modification. | Does not demonstrate designated technique/skills.  Inappropriate materials were selected and contributed to a product that performed poorly. |  |
| **Project**  **Management (50%)** | **16-20** | **13-15** | **10-12** | **8-9** | **0-7** | **Comments** |
|  | Excellent in project management.  All parts of the project are complete ahead of time with extra advanced features.  Overall an excellent project management. | Good in project management. All parts of the project are completed and turned in on time.  Overall a good  project management. | Satisfactory in project management. Most parts of the project are completed  and turned in on time.  Overall satisfactory project | Weak in project management. Some parts of the project  are completed and turned in on time.  Overall poor project management. | Unsatisfactory in project management. No parts of the project are completed on time.  Overall  unsatisfactory project |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | management. |  | management. |  |
| **Neatness &**  **Orderliness (50%)** | **16-20** | **13-15** | **10-12** | **8-9** | **0-7** | **Comments** |
|  | Excellent in reporting the project progress. The reports are organized in a clean and neat manner.  Team work progress and next milestones of the project are clearly explained all times with good justification.  Overall an excellent reporting the project progress. | Good in reporting the project progress.  The reports are organized in a clean and neat manner. Team work progress and next milestones of the project are clearly explained most of the time.  Overall an good reporting the project progress. | Satisfactory in reporting the project progress. The reports are organized in an unclean and untidy manner occasionally.  Team work progress and next milestones of the project are not clearly explained occasionally.  Overall an satisfactory reporting the project progress. | Poor in reporting the project progress.  The reports are organized in an unclean and untidy manner most of the time.  Team work progress and next milestones of the project are not clearly explained most of the time. Overall a poor reporting the project progress. | Unsatisfactory in reporting the project progress. The reports are organized in an unclean and untidy manner all times. Team work progress and next milestones of the project are not clearly explained all times.  Overall an unsatisfactory reporting the project progress. |  |