

Assessment Rubric for Data Warehousing & Data Mining Assessment 1.

STUDENT

GRADE

Criteria	Fail (0-29%)	Marginal Fail (30-39%)	Satisfactory (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-84%)	Exceptional (85-100%)
Understanding of OLTP vs Data Warehouse (Task 1, 10%)	Little to no understanding of OLTP or data warehouses. Discussion lacks relevance to the case study.	Minimal understanding of OLTP and data warehouses. Discussion is poorly applied to the case study context.	Basic understanding of OLTP vs data warehouses. Some relevance to the case study, but lacking depth or clarity.	Clear understanding of OLTP vs data warehouses. Discussion is relevant to the case study and demonstrates basic application.	Strong understanding of OLTP vs data warehouses with detailed and relevant discussion applied to the case study.	Excellent understanding of OLTP vs data warehouses with well-structured and insightful discussion applied to the case study.	Exceptional understanding of OLTP vs data warehouses, demonstrating nuanced insights and innovative application to the case study.
Data Warehouse Architecture and ETL (Task 1, 15%)	No explanation of data warehouse architecture or ETL process. Diagrams missing or irrelevant.	Weak explanation of data warehouse architecture or ETL process. Diagrams are unclear or poorly applied.	Basic explanation of data warehouse architecture and ETL process with relevant but simple diagrams.	Clear explanation of data warehouse architecture and ETL process, supported by relevant diagrams.	Strong explanation of data warehouse architecture and ETL process with detailed and accurate diagrams.	Comprehensive explanation of data warehouse architecture and ETL process with insightful and precise diagrams.	Exceptional explanation of data warehouse architecture and ETL process with innovative insights and professional-quality diagrams.
Use of Data Marts (Task 1, 15%)	No explanation of data marts or their relevance to the case study.	Minimal understanding of data marts. Relevance to the case study is weak or unclear.	Basic explanation of data marts with some relevance to the case study.	Clear explanation of data marts and their application to the case study.	Strong explanation of data marts with detailed and relevant application to the case study.	Excellent explanation of data marts with insightful discussion and clear relevance to the case study.	Exceptional explanation of data marts, demonstrating innovative and highly relevant application to the case study.

Star Schema and Dimensions (Task 1, 10%)	No explanation of star schema or its components. Diagrams missing or irrelevant.	Weak explanation of star schema with minimal understanding of facts and dimensions. Diagrams are unclear or poorly applied.	Basic explanation of star schema and its components with simple but relevant diagrams.	Clear explanation of star schema and its components with appropriate and accurate diagrams.	Strong explanation of star schema and its components with detailed and insightful diagrams.	Comprehensive explanation of star schema and its components with well-structured and precise diagrams.	Exceptional explanation of star schema and its components, demonstrating innovative insights and professional-quality diagrams.
Identification of Sources and Schema (Task 2, 25%)	Sources and schema are incomplete or missing. No connection to case study requirements.	Limited identification of sources and schema with weak or unclear connection to case study requirements.	Basic identification of sources and schema with some relevance to the case study.	Clear identification of sources and schema, relevant to the case study and demonstrating understanding of requirements.	Strong identification of sources and schema with detailed and accurate application to the case study.	Excellent identification of sources and schema with insightful and precise application to the case study.	Exceptional identification of sources and schema, demonstrating innovative and highly relevant application to the case study.
ETL Plan and Data Governance (Task 2, 25%)	ETL plan and governance issues are incomplete or missing. No relevance to case study.	Minimal ETL plan with limited discussion of governance issues. Weak relevance to the case study.	Basic ETL plan with some discussion of governance issues. Relevance to the case study is clear but lacks depth.	Clear ETL plan with relevant discussion of governance issues. Demonstrates understanding of case study requirements.	Strong ETL plan with detailed and relevant discussion of governance issues.	Excellent ETL plan with insightful and precise discussion of governance issues.	Exceptional ETL plan with innovative insights and comprehensive discussion of governance issues, highly relevant to the case study.

Comments