

Data Modeling Project Rubric Student Assessment

The Data Modeling project assessment is based on your performance as an individual and as a group member. The Project grade consists of 36 points for individual work and 8 points for the collective work of the group. The rubric outlines the criteria for assessment.

Student Name _____

Category	4	3	2	1	Points	Weight	Score * Points * wt
ER-Model Entities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 90-100% of the entities modeled were clearly explained and justified in both the presentation and documentation. - 90-100% of the identified entities used correct naming conventions. - There was no confusion between attributes and entities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80-89% of the entities modeled were clearly explained and justified in both the presentation and documentation. - 80-89% of the identified entities used correct naming conventions. - There was no confusion between attributes and entities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70-79% of the entities modeled were clearly explained and justified in both the presentation and the documentation. - 70-79% of the identified entities used correct naming conventions. - There was no confusion between attributes and entities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0-69% of the entities modeled were clearly explained and justified in both the presentation and the documentation. - 0-69% of the identified entities used correct naming conventions. - There was confusion between attributes and entities. 		1	
ER-Model Attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 90-100% of the entities modeled, contained the appropriate attributes. - 90-100% of the attributes listed used the correct naming conventions. - The Unique Identifier where indicated was clearly labeled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80-89% of the entities modeled contained the appropriate attributes. - 80-89% of the attributes listed used the correct naming conventions. - The Unique Identifier where indicated was clearly labeled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70-79% of the entities modeled contained the appropriate attributes. - 70-79% of the attributes listed used the correct naming conventions. - The Unique Identifier where indicated was clearly labeled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0-69% of the entities modeled contained the appropriate attributes. - 0-69% of the attributes listed used the correct naming conventions. - The Unique Identifier where indicated was not clearly labeled. 		1	
ER-Model Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 90-100% of the relationships have the appropriate name, direction, optionality and degree/cardinality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80-89% of the relationships have the appropriate name, direction, optionality and degree/cardinality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70-79% of the relationships have the appropriate name, direction, optionality and degree/cardinality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0-69% of relationships have the appropriate name, direction, optionality and/or degree/cardinality. 		1	

ER-Model Layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 90-100% of the entity positions and relationship directions are logical and clear from the client's perspective. - 90-100% of the assumptions made in creating the ERD were clearly explained and supported by the case study. - The ERD was in 3rd Normal form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80-89% of the entity positions and relationship directions are logical and clear from the client's perspective. - 80-89% of the assumptions made in creating the ERD were clearly explained and supported by the case study. - The ERD was in 3rd Normal form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70-79% of the entity positions and relationship directions are logical and clear from the client's perspective. - 70-79% of the assumptions made in creating the ERD were clearly explained, and supported by the case study. - The ERD was in 2nd Normal form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0-69% of the entity positions and relationship directions are logical sequence and clear from the client's perspective. - 0-69% of the assumptions made in creating the ERD were clearly explained and supported by the case study. - The ERD was not normalized. 	1	
Presentation Materials and Written Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Images, fonts, colors and text size enhanced the presentation. There was a consistent theme throughout 90-100% of the materials. - The written documentation includes all requirements noted below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Introduction: o Overview: o ERD Diagram o Tables: o Conclusion o Recommendations - Correct grammar and spelling used throughout 90-100% of materials and documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Images, fonts, colors and text size enhanced the presentation. There was a consistent theme throughout 80-89% of the materials. - The written documentation is missing one of the requirements noted below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Introduction: o Overview: o ERD Diagram o Tables: o Conclusion o Recommendations - Correct grammar and spelling used throughout 80-89% of materials and documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Images, fonts, colors and text size enhanced the presentation. There was a consistent theme throughout 70-79% of the materials. - The written documentation is missing two requirements noted below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Introduction: o Overview: o ERD Diagram o Tables: o Conclusion o Recommendations - Correct grammar and spelling used throughout 70-79% of materials and documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Images, fonts, colors and text size did not enhance the presentation. There was a consistent theme throughout 0-69% of the materials. - The written documentation is missing three or more requirements noted below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Introduction: o Overview: o ERD Diagram o Tables: o Conclusion o Recommendations - Correct grammar and spelling used throughout 0-69% of materials and documentation. 	3	
Individual Presentation - Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual presented a portion of each of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o entities o attributes o relationships o tables - Individual used eye contact, upright posture, gestures and other nonverbal communication to persuade the client of the superiority of their ERD. - Individual answered 90-100% of the questions using clear, concise rationale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual presented a portion of 3 of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o entities o attributes o relationships o tables - Individual's eye contact, upright posture, gestures and other nonverbal communication did not contribute to the persuasive quality of the presentation. - Individual answered 80-89% of the questions using clear, concise rationale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual presented a portion of 2 of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o entities o attributes o relationships o tables - Individual's eye contact, upright posture, gestures and other nonverbal communication were distracting to the overall quality of the presentation. - Individual answered 70-79% of the questions using clear, concise rationale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual presented a portion of 1 of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o entities o attributes o relationships o tables - Individual's eye contact, upright posture, gestures and other nonverbal communication were distracting to the overall quality of the presentation. - Individual answered 0-69% of the questions using clear, concise rationale 	2	
Group Presentation - Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The group presentation has a central message. 90-100% of the supporting arguments are persuasive. - 90-100% of the analysis of the client's business rules, operations, and processes is accurate, logical, and clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The group presentation has a central message. 80-89% of the supporting arguments are persuasive. - 80-89% of the analysis of the client's business rules, operations, and processes is accurate, logical, and clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The group presentation has a central message. 70-79% of the supporting arguments are persuasive. - 70-79% of the analysis of the client's business rules, operations, and processes is accurate, logical, and clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The group presentation lacks a central message and 0-69% of the supporting arguments are persuasive. - 0-69% of the analysis of the client's business rules, operations, and processes is accurate, logical, and clear. 	2	
40 - 44 is equivalent to 90-100% 36 - 39 is equivalent to 80-89%		32 - 35 is equivalent to 70-79% 28 - 31 is equivalent to 60-69%		TOTAL POINTS		