WEB2P coursework marking form 2011-2012s2

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| Functionality  compared 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 |