

## Project Grading Rubric (SCIE 302, 2012)

Excellent		Good	Needs Improvement	Poor
<i>PART I</i>				
Description of scenarios (minimum of TWO).	Clear description of the scenario identifying the overall effect of the manipulations, people bribing you are clearly identified and the benefit they will gain from the manipulation.	All elements are present but there are gaps in the argument that the reader must fill in themselves.	Elements are missing or logical inconsistencies.	No attempt is made to outline a cogent scenario.
Implementation quality (minimum of TWO).	Clearly identifies each scenario being addressed, conditions for activating the scenario are described, changes in code are identified as well as how these small changes have their effect and how they lead to implement the scenario.	All elements are present but there are gaps that the reader must fill in themselves.	Elements are missing or logical inconsistencies.	No attempt is made to outline a cogent scenario.
Implementation Quality.	Provides compelling and accurate evidence that convinces reader to accept main argument. The importance/relevance of all pieces of evidence is clearly stated. There are no gaps in reasoning—i.e., the reader does not need to assume anything or do additional research to fully understand what is discussed.	Provides necessary evidence to convince reader of most aspects of the main argument but not all. The importance/ relevance of some evidence presented may not be totally clear. Reader must make a few mental leaps or do some additional research to fully understand what is discussed.	Not enough evidence is provided to support author's argument, or evidence is incomplete, incorrect, or oversimplified. Information from readings is not effectively used.	Either no evidence is provided, or there are numerous factual mistakes, omissions or oversimplifications. There is little or no mention of information from readings.

Excellent		Good	Needs Improvement	Poor
<i>PART II</i>				
Thoroughness of analysis	Use of multiple techniques including the use of an automated tool, reflection on the pros and cons of each, identification of what worked for you and whether it was as you expected and a discussion of other approaches and their pros and cons (for example, other automated tools you have not had time to try out).	Description of a process that involved applying a single technique such as reading through the code with reflection on types of problems this is likely to uncover and those it is less likely to uncover, and a short discussion of other approaches that were not tried.	Missing some components of the discussion of the analysis.	No real attempt made.
Success of analysis	Excellent pass clearly identifies both accidental and malicious problems, clearly identifies the impact of these problems and identifies them in the code, provides a reasonable explanation for why the deliberate problem might have been introduced and identifies a reasonable way to mitigate the deliberate problems that have been discovered.	Identifies some non-malicious problems in the code as well as a malicious problem, the areas of the code would be identified with minimal explanation of the potential impact of these problems. There would be an attempt to determine if a problem might have been deliberately introduced by no clear answer.	Missing some components of the discussion of the analysis.	No real attempt made.
Reflection on process	Pros and cons of source code and bytecode analysis discussed. Reflects upon the limits of both types of analysis.	Pros and cons discussed but no attempt to generalise beyond the specifics of what was done.	Missing some parts of the argument such as linking the what, how and why of the reflection.	No real attempt.