

Project Evaluation Rubrics
(Fill this sheet for Group Mark and Submit it as a PDF file with signature)
Ajloun national university

Faculty of information technology– Project II Grading Rubric for Thesis Report and poster (20 Marks)

Project Title		Section No:
All Student IDs:	Student Names :	
Examiner's Name:	Date:	

Report Contents / Marks	Evaluation area	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Scored Marks (Total = 20)
Front Contents (3 Marks)	1. Cover Page & Title Page 2. Certificate 3. Abstract 4. Table of Contents 5. List of Tables 6. List of Figures 7. List of Symbols & Abbreviations	0-5.9	6- 8.9	9-10	----- /3
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete or unorganized. • Project Title is unspecified, unfocused. • Abstract is unrelated to problem statement, aim, objectives and project contribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partially complete and disorganized. • Insufficient Project title • Abstract is partially related to problem statement, aim, objectives, & project contribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and covers all the mentioned titles. • Appropriate project title. • Abstract is well written. 	
Project1 Chapters Contents (5 Marks)	Chapter 1: Introduction Chapter 2: Background/Existing Work Chapter 3: System Analysis and Requirements Overall Incorporation of Suggestions given during Project 1.	0-5.9	6- 8.9	9-10	-----/5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete in Problem statement, Aims, Objectives and Contributions, Project Scope, Project Plan, Thesis Organization • Incomplete in history & importance of the project topic. • Incomplete/unorganized Literature survey Comparison table and inappropriate hardware & software requirements. • Incomplete System analysis & requirements design and Development Methodology, Feasibility Analysis, UML models and diagrams, System Requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partially states Problem statement, Aims, Objectives and Contributions, Project Scope, Project Plan, Thesis Organization • Partially covers the history & importance of the project topic. • Partially organized Literature survey Comparison table and hardware & software requirements. • Complete and somewhat updated Software Development Methodology, Feasibility Analysis, UML models and diagrams, System Requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and covers introduction part clearly. • Background information is appropriate. • Comprehensive literature review and have h/w & s/w requirements. • Completely covers the system analysis & requirements topic. • Complete and includes updated system design topics. • Changes are made as suggested during Project 1 and new innovations added. 	
	Chapter 4: System Design Chapter5: System Implementation & Validation	0-5.9	6- 8.9	9-10	-----/5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete & fail to update, Context Flow Diagrams, Data Flow Diagrams, Forms Design, E-R Diagrams, and Database Tables. • Suggestions during Project 1 evaluation are not incorporated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and somewhat updated Context Flow Diagrams, Data Flow Diagrams, Forms Design, E-R Diagrams, and Database Tables • All major changes are made as suggested during Project 1 evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student implemented all elements of the proposed methodology. • Appropriate division of problem into modules and good selection of computing framework /database. 	

Main Chapters Contents (5 Marks)	Chapter 6: Conclusions and Future Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student was not able to or had difficulty to implement the proposed methodology. • Division of problem into modules but inappropriate selection of computing Framework / database. • Coding information is not available. • Results are not presented properly. • Not able to or had difficulty implementing the procedures to test the correctness of the implemented artifact. • Testing plan and test cases are not defined properly • Project work is not summarized and concluded. <p>Future extensions in the project are not specified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • .Student implemented some elements of the proposed methodology. • Partial division of problem into modules and inappropriate selection of computing framework /database. • Coding part is incomplete. • Results presented are not much satisfactory. • Partially implement the procedures to test the correctness of the implemented artifact. • Testing plan and test cases are partially defined or shown. • Project work summary and conclusion not very appropriate. <p>Future extensions in the project are specified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coding section is covered appropriately. • Results are presented in very appropriate manner. • Student acquired the necessary procedures to test the correctness of the implemented artifact skillfully. • Appropriate Testing plan and test cases. • Project work is well summarized and concluded. • Future extensions in the project are well specified. 	
End Contents (2 Marks)	References Appendix: Project Plan & Program codes &Poster	0-5.9	6- 8.9	9-10	-----/2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References and citations are not appropriate. • Project plan is not available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References and citations are appropriate but not mentioned well. • Team roles, Milestones, deliverables and Project plan Time frame are not properly specified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References and citations are appropriate & well mentioned. • Team roles, Milestones, deliverables and Project plan Time frame properly specified and being followed. 	
Poster (5 Marks)	Poster	0-5.9	6- 8.9	9-10	-----/5
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poster is not available. • The poster is distractingly messy or very poorly designed. It is not attractive. • Graphics do not relate to the topic • Significant amounts of technical detail are lacking. • Poster does not include enough results to draw conclusions. • There are more grammatical mistakes on the poster. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The poster is a bit messy. • Many graphics are not clear or are too small. • Some technical information was too detailed or was lacking. • Presentation includes only few results to draw conclusions. • There are few grammatical mistakes on the poster. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The poster is exceptionally attractive in terms of design, layout, and neatness. • Graphics are easily viewed and are related to the topic, making the material easier to understand. • Includes thorough description of analysis, results and explains the importance of the results. • There are no grammatical mistakes on the poster. 	
Thesis overall Evaluation & Comments					
Examiner's Name :			Signature:	Total (20 Marks)	

