

## FINAL YEAR PROJECT PART 1 RUBRIC SCORE

	Exemplary (80-100%)	Good (65-79%)	Needs Improvement (50-64%)	Unsatisfactory (0-49%)	Marks
Problem Statement / Background Study 5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Report illustrates clear identification and thorough decomposition of objectives;</li> <li>· Objectives and goals are stated in such a way that the project scope and functional specifications are clearly identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Report illustrates identification and decomposition of design objectives but the relative importance of objectives are not evaluated by team members.</li> <li>· Objective and goals are stated in terms of project scope and functional specifications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Report illustrates a limited understanding about objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Report illustrates inaccurate understanding of the objectives and goals of the project.</li> <li>· Objectives are irrelevant with the functional specifications of the project.</li> <li>· No technical information has been thought of to identify the scope of the project.</li> </ul>	
Requirement Analysis (Specifications and Constraints) 10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The degrees to which the functional specifications will be attained are compared to real world constraints.</li> <li>· All possible constraints of the project are discussed.</li> <li>· Specifications are clearly identified and stated in quantifiable manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Expected performance has been mentioned and compared to meeting real world constraints but discussions about some of the constraints are missing.</li> <li>· Specifications are identified, but are stated in a somewhat unclear manner.</li> <li>· Awkward quantifications are provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Functional description of the project is provided.</li> <li>· No additional constraints rather than the ones given in the project description are discussed.</li> <li>· Specifications are partially identified. No quantification is provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Specifications and expected performance to meet real world constraints are missing and not thought of.</li> </ul>	
Literature Review 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Information presented displays expanded scope and relevance and is organized to enhance response to the problem presented showing evidence of a critique of prior work on the problem.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Information presented related to problem displays expanded scope and relevance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Appropriate information related to problem is presented with appropriate citations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Weak or inappropriate information related to problem is presented; lack of appropriate citations.</li> </ul>	

	Exemplary (80-100%)	Good (65-79%)	Needs Improvement (50-64%)	Unsatisfactory (0-49%)	Marks
Methodology 10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed solution approach is clearly defined, supported by references on existing relevant works or products.</li> <li>The logical sequence of principal methods and their particular purpose are given in details.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed solution approach is clearly defined.</li> <li>The sequence of principal methods and their particular purpose are given without any systematic or logics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed solution approach is defined with coarse description.</li> <li>The solution to achieve the objective exists but does not reflect a clear understanding of the method.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed solution approach is insufficiently described with no or erroneous decomposition of method.</li> <li>The method does not reflect a realistic approach.</li> </ul>	
Hardware/ Software Application 5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete, well specified hardware and software requirements</li> <li>Development platform and environment well specified and justified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete specification of hardware and software requirements</li> <li>Strategies for dealing with any differences between target and test platforms included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of the details of the target or development platforms and/or software, network, or database compatibilities are incomplete</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the details of the target or development platforms are incomplete.</li> </ul>	
Data Analysis and Design 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students correctly identify trends and are able to draw suitable accurate conclusions from the data.</li> <li>Students can recognize errors and inaccuracies in the processed, manipulated and presented data and their analysis.</li> <li>Students are able to relate presented data to other knowledge</li> <li>Complete or 90% and above accurate requirements list, use case diagrams and descriptions, class and communication diagrams or other analysis diagrams. Non-functional requirements should be considered where appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students identify trends and are able to draw conclusions from the data. There are few inaccuracies in analysis.</li> <li>Students can recognize some errors and inaccuracies in the processed, manipulated and presented data.</li> <li>Students are able to make some links to prior knowledge.</li> <li>Up to 75% Requirements list, use case diagrams and descriptions, class and communication diagrams or other analysis diagrams. Non-functional requirements should be considered where appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students attempts to identify trends to draw conclusions from the data.</li> <li>There are inaccuracies in analysis Students attempt to make some links to prior knowledge.</li> <li>Up to 50% missing requirements list, use case diagrams and descriptions, class and communication diagrams or other analysis diagrams. Non-functional requirements should be considered where appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students make no attempt to analyse data or draw conclusions or the analysis is fundamentally flawed.</li> <li>Students make no attempt to links to prior knowledge.</li> <li>Very poor or below 50% requirements list, use case diagrams and descriptions, class and communication diagrams or other analysis diagrams. Non-functional requirements should be considered where appropriate</li> </ul>	