APSW coursework 2 marking form 2012-2013

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student being marked       | Marker(s)       |

Tick one box (or at most two adjacent boxes) in each row…

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| Functionalitycompared with requirements | [ ]  Provides all functionality | [ ]  Provides most functionality | [ ]  Provides some functionality  | [ ]  Provides little functionality  | [ ]  Does almost nothing | [ ]  Does nothing |
| Usability compared with interface design | [ ]  Very easy to use  | [ ]  Easy to use | [ ]  Usable | [ ]  Hard to use  | [ ]  Very hard to use | [ ]  Unusable |
| Use of web programming features | [ ]  Uses JSF/AJAX/CSS well  | [ ]  Meets two of the above, but sub-standard in the third | [ ]  Uses MVC-2 and works OK | [ ]  Does not use MVC-2 but still works OK | [ ]  Does not use MVC-2 and works badly | [ ]  No significant use of web programming features |
| Persistence | [ ]  Excellent use of EJB and JPA facilities and facades | [ ]  Meets two of the above, but sub-standard in the third | [ ]  Some use of EJB, JPA or facades | [ ]  No use of EJB or JPA but still works OK | [ ]  Poor use of JDBC | [ ]  No access to database |
| Source code | [ ]  All code self-documenting and clear + good use of OO features e.g. inheritance + well expressed algorithms, and APIs | [ ]  Meets 2 of the above but deficient in the third | [ ]  Some self-documenting code + some use of classes | [ ]  Some self-documenting code OR some use of classes (other than standard servlet/JSP classes) | [ ]  Some evidence of understanding how to write the source code | [ ]  Nothing sensible submitted |
| Javadocs | [ ]  All (100%) complete and very informative | [ ]  Nearly all complete and informative | [ ]  Some complete and informative OR all done but not very informative | [ ]  Only some Javadocs | [ ]  Partial but poor attempt at Javadocs | [ ]  No Javadocs |
| Requirements specification | [ ]  Excellently presented + full specification + credible to implement | [ ]  Meets two of the above, but sub-standard in the third  | [ ]  A basic requirements specification | [ ]  Shows evidence of meeting the criteria of a requirements specification | [ ]  A reasonable attempt but not reaching the above standard | [ ]  Nothing sensible submitted |
| User interface specification | [ ]  Excellently presented + full specification + credible to implement | [ ]  Meets two of the above, but sub-standard in the third  | [ ]  A basic user interface specification | [ ]  Shows evidence of meeting the criteria of a user interface specification | [ ]  A reasonable attempt but not reaching the above standard | [ ]  Nothing sensible submitted |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Marks | Comments |
| SUB-TOTAL ABOVE (Maximum 40 marks) |       |  |
| Deduct 5 marks if program does not compile (all or part) | 0 |
| Deduct 5 marks if program does not run | 0 |
| Deduct up to 5 marks if significant functionality missing  | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | 0 |