



FACULTY OF BUSINES
BACHELOR OF E-COMMERCE
LEARNING MODULE OUTLINE

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| Academic Year | 2023 / 2024 | Semester | 1 |
| Module Code | MGPO4100 - 411 | | |
| Learning Module | Graduation Report I | | |
| Pre-requisite(s) | Nil | | |
| Medium of Instruction | English | | |
| Credits | 6 | Contact Hours | 90 |
| Instructor | Billy Yu | Email | billyyu@mpu.edu.mo |
| Office | M534, Meng Tak Building | Office Phone | 8599-3312 |

MODULE DESCRIPTION

This is an integrated module which requires students to apply their knowledge and skills acquired in previous courses to accomplish a project by pursuing an in-depth and hands on study in a selected topic in E-Commerce applications. Students are required to complete a project proposal by the end of this course before proceeding to Graduation Report II.

MODULE INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILOS)

On completion of this learning module, students will be able to:

| | |
|-----|--|
| M1. | explain the skills, techniques, and knowledge for completing the Reports as stipulated in the Guidelines on the Graduation Reports I and II, |
| M2. | apply such skills, techniques, and knowledge to complete the Reports, |
| M3. | manage general and e-commerce-specific projects, |
| M4. | practise leadership in the context of project teamwork, |
| M5. | collaborate and cooperate in the context of project teamwork, and |
| M6. | present project information in both verbal and written formats. |



These ILOs aims to enable students to attain the following Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs):

| PILOs | M1 | M2 | M3 | M4 | M5 | M6 |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| P1. Demonstrate an understanding of the business processes and operations and the skilful realization of information technologies required to practice electronic commerce. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| P2. Apply knowledge in business, mathematics, programming, computing, web development, and database to address complex problems in the context of electronic commerce. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| P3. Analyse critically the effect of web technology use on organizational performance and develop electronic commerce strategies that fit organizational objectives. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| P4. Select and apply tools and technologies to effectively implement electronic commerce systems in business intelligence, enterprise resources planning, supply chain management, and customer relationship management. | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| P5. Develop relationships, motivate others, manage conflicts, lead changes, and work across differences in multi-disciplinary electronic commerce projects. | | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| P6. Communicate and work effectively using written and spoken word, non- verbal language, and electronic tools with fellow professionals and different stakeholders in the electronic commerce industry. | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| P7. Demonstrate a global electronic commerce perspective as evidenced by an understanding of foreign languages and the role of Macau as an interface between the East and the West. | | | | | | ✓ |
| P8. Cope with and manage contemporary advancement related to electronic commerce development and demonstrate lifelong learning attitudes and abilities. | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| P9. Conduct research and devise innovative electronic commerce models to exploit business opportunities. | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| P10. Reflect on professional responsibilities and keep up with the latest electronic commerce issues on legal, environmental, ethical, and societal considerations to benefit society comprehensively. | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |



MODULE SCHEDULE, COVERAGE AND STUDY LOAD

Students are required to deliver their Reports as stipulated in the Guidelines on the Graduation Reports I and II (attached) under the guidance of their supervisor.

TEACHING AND LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Team meetings, oral presentation, report writing, software development and /or information system development as stipulated in the Guidelines on the Graduation Reports I and II (attached) under the guidance of their supervisor.

ATTENDANCE

Attendance requirements are governed by the Academic Regulations Governing Bachelor's Degree Programmes of the Macao Polytechnic University. Students who do not meet the attendance requirements for the learning module shall be awarded an 'F' grade.

ASSESSMENT

Students are required to complete the following assessment activities as stipulated in the Guidelines on the Graduation Reports I and II (attached) under the guidance of their supervisor:

| Assessment Items | Weighting (%) | ILOs to be Assessed |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| A1. The Study Report and the developed information system or software tool | 60% | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| A2. Oral presentation | 30% | 4, 5, 6 |
| A3. Contribution and ongoing performance of individual student | 10% | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 |

The assessment will be conducted following the University's Assessment Strategy (see www.mpu.edu.mo/teaching_learning/en/assessment_strategy.php). Passing this learning module indicates that students will have attained the ILOs of this learning module and thus acquired its credits.

MARKING SCHEME

This learning module is graded on a 100-point scale, with 100 as the highest possible score and 50 as the passing score. The grading criteria of the different assessment activities are stipulated in the (attached) Guidelines on the Graduation Reports I and II. The assessment criteria help ensure students understand what is expected at each grade level for each assessment activity.

REQUIRED READINGS

- The supervisor will provide the learning materials to students as per the selected project topic. There is no suggested textbook.



REFERENCES

- The supervisor will provide the learning materials to students as per the selected project topic.

STUDENT FEEDBACK

At the end of every semester, students are invited to provide feedback on the learning module and the teaching arrangement through questionnaires. Your feedback is valuable for instructors to enhance the module and its delivery for future students. The instructor and programme coordinators will consider all feedback and respond with actions formally in the annual programme review.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The Macao Polytechnic University requires students to have full commitment to academic integrity when engaging in research and academic activities. Violations of academic integrity, which include but are not limited to plagiarism, collusion, fabrication or falsification, repeated use of assignments and cheating in examinations, are considered as serious academic offenses and may lead to disciplinary actions. Students should read the relevant regulations and guidelines in the Student Handbook which is distributed upon the admission into the University, a copy of which can also be found at www.mpu.edu.mo/student_handbook.

Bachelor of E-Commerce Programme

MGPO4100 (Graduation Report I) and MGPO4110 (Graduation Report II) Project Guidelines First and Second Semester, 2023/24

The Graduation Report (Report) aims to provide students with an opportunity to apply the knowledge they have acquired to a real-life topic. The Report comprises Reports I and II, which are to be completed respectively in the first and second semesters.

Students are required to form a project team of two or three persons and work on a topic under the guidance of an appointed supervisor. There are two approach options, namely, approach A and approach B, that each team may choose. Each team should consult with their supervisor for a mutually agreed topic and approach option. The team's composition, the topic, and the approach option to be submitted in a Graduation Report proposal (see Appendix 1) are then subject to the Faculty's approval.

For approach A projects, students identify and develop an information system to the benefit of an organization or of values to a target market. The primary outputs of approach A projects are (1) a Study Report that presents the activities and deliverables of all phases of the system development and (2) a fully operational version of the information system with all proposed features and functionalities implemented.

For approach B projects, students conduct a purposeful investigation of an e-commerce-related topic. The primary outputs of approach B projects are (1) a Study Report presenting the purpose, background, design, results, interpretations, and reflections of the investigation and (2) a prototype of a software tool developed to help with the project's data collection or data analysis.

Whether approach A or approach B is chosen, the Report will be marked by two faculty members, including the project supervisor. The Programme External Examiner will also be invited to remark samples of the Report, and responsible internal evaluators may be asked to justify their marking in case irregularities are found. The major components and assessment rubrics for the Report are detailed in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3, respectively. The assessment policy for the Report is as follows:

| Evaluation Component | Weight | Evaluator(s) | |
|--|---------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | Report I | Report II |
| 1 The Study Report and the developed information system or software tool | 60% | Supervisor | Supervisor, Second Assessor |
| 2 Oral presentation | 30% | Supervisor, Second Assessor | Supervisor, Second Assessor |
| 3 Contribution and ongoing performance of individual student | 10% | Supervisor | Supervisor |
| Total | 100% | | |

Throughout the academic year, students are supposed to work according to the project schedule (see Appendix 4) and meet with their supervisors at least once a week for consultation. Each meeting is to be logged in a progress log (see Appendix 5).

Bachelor of E-Commerce Programme
Graduation Report (MGPO4100/4110) Proposal

Please fill in and sign a copy of this proposal and file it with the Supervisor.

Topic: _____

Approach: _____ A / B (Please delete as appropriate.) _____

Please note the following conditions:

1. After the submission deadline on x September 2023, neither withdrawal nor addition of team member(s) will not be encouraged, and any such cases must be approved by the school.
2. After the submission deadline on x September 2023, switching of the supervisor will not usually be approved by the school.
3. After the submission deadline on x September 2023, change of the Approach will not usually be approved by the school.

| Team Member's Name | Student No. | Signature |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------|
| 1. | | |
| 2. | | |
| 3. | | |

Supervisor: _____ Signature: _____

| |
|--|
| <p>For Office Use Only:</p> <p>Programme Coordinator's Signature: _____</p> <p>Date: _____</p> |
|--|

Graduation Report (MGPO4100/4110) Components, Contents and Deliverables

Approach A Project

| | | Report Component | Suggested Contents and/or Deliverables* |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| MGPO4110 (Graduation Report II) | MGPO4100 (Graduation Report I) | Target Market/ Organisation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background, description of the business, product/service description, customer portfolio |
| | | Business Analysis and E-Business Initiative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business analysis with relevant analytical model(s) such as five forces analysis, critical success factors, strength-weakness-opportunity-threat analysis, etc. • An e-business initiative resulting from the business analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Objectives and scopes of the initiative |
| | | Requirements Specification | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functional requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use case diagram and use case narratives ○ Description of the business processes • Non-functional requirements |
| | | System Design | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design models such as class diagrams, object diagrams, communication diagrams, sequence diagrams, activity diagrams, and state diagrams • User interface design • System architecture, e.g., network diagrams • Hardware and software platform • Choice of programming language(s), • Implementation plan, e.g., Gantt charts |
| | Implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the proposed information system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation that explains clearly how each core system feature and functionality is implemented ○ Fully operational version of the information system that demonstrates the specified features and functionalities | |
| | Test | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing of the proposed information system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test plans such as the unit test, integration test, and product test ○ Test cases and results corresponding to the above test plans | |
| | Documentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User manuals such as a user guide, reference manual, and installation manual | |
| | Abstract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A structured abstract of around 1000 words (4 to 8 pages, including diagrams) that includes (i) the background of the system development, (ii) the main features and functionalities of the developed system, and (iii) the development process of the artefact | |

* Students should consult their supervisors for the most appropriate deliverables and content of their study.

Graduation Report (MGPO4100/4110) Components, Contents and Deliverables

Approach B Project

| | | Report Component | Suggested Content and/or Deliverables* |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| MGPO4100 (Graduation Report I) | MGPO4110 (Graduation Report II) | Introduction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose, objectives, scope, and value of the study |
| | | Background and Problem Definition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A real-world area that is worthy of study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Background of the study ○ Problem definition ○ Rationale of the study |
| | | Intellectual Framework and Literature Review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A framework of ideas to make sense of the study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Literature review of previous influential studies in similar domains ○ Definitions of key concepts ○ A theoretical framework or model to guide the study |
| | | Design and Methodology of the Study | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific procedures and/or techniques used to conduct the study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Study workflow ○ Procedures and techniques for data collection and data analyses ○ Study plan, e.g., Gantt charts |
| | | Software Tool Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A software tool developed for data collection, quantitative analysis, or simulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prototype of the developed software tool ○ Documentation of the installation, functionalities, and usage of the software tool |
| | Results and Findings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings resulting from the execution of the adopted methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of the methodology ○ Data collected ○ Processes and results of data analyses | |
| | Discussions and Implications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection on the study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interpretation of the findings ○ Discussion and implications related to the findings and study purpose ○ Recommendations and limitations of the study; areas for further study | |
| | Conclusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A conclusion recaps what the study is about, what it aims to examine, what is its relevance, and what is achieved or its important findings | |
| | Abstract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A structured abstract of around 1500 words (5 to 8 pages, including diagrams) that includes (i) the purpose of the study, (ii) design/methodology/approach, (iii) key findings of the study, (iv) managerial and/or practical implications, and (v) conclusion | |

* Students should consult their supervisors for the most appropriate deliverables and content of their study.

Assessment Rubric for MGPO4100 Study Report (Approach A)

Project Title:

Student Names:

| Assessment Criterion | Level of Comprehensiveness (Please mark the level achieved for each criterion) | | | | | Full Mark | Level Achieved | Mark Given |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|------------|----------------|------------|
| | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Target Market/Organisation | | | | | | 5 | | |
| Background of the market/organisation | Not presented | Poorly presented and described | Briefly presented and described | Appropriately presented and described | Clearly presented and well described | | | |
| Business Analysis and E-Business Initiative | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Business analysis with analytical model(s) | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| E-business initiative | Not defined | Poorly defined | Given | Given and defined | Given and clearly defined | | | |
| Feasibility analysis of the initiative | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | 20 | | |
| Requirements Specification | | | | | | | | |
| Functional requirements gathered | None | Irrelevant and inadequate | Somewhat relevant but inadequate | Relevant and adequate | Relevant, adequate, and comprehensive | | | |
| Non-functional requirements gathered | None | Irrelevant and inadequate | Somewhat relevant but inadequate | Relevant and adequate | Relevant, adequate, and comprehensive | | | |
| Use of specification notations and formats | None | Inaccurate and inappropriate | Somewhat accurate and appropriate | Accurate and appropriate | Very accurate and appropriate | 35 | | |
| System Design | | | | | | | | |
| Mapping of requirements to design | None | Unclear and inappropriate | Fairly clear and appropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Data design (structure of the information system) | None | Inadequate and inappropriate | Somewhat adequate and appropriate | Adequate and appropriate | Adequate, appropriate, and comprehensive | | | |
| Process design (behaviour of the information system) | None | Inadequate and inappropriate | Somewhat adequate and appropriate | Adequate and appropriate | Adequate, appropriate, and comprehensive | | | |
| User interface design (user experience) | None | Unclear and inappropriate | Fairly clear and appropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Use of design notations and format | None | Inaccurate and inappropriate | Somewhat accurate and appropriate | Accurate and appropriate | Very accurate and appropriate | | | |
| Others (system architecture, hardware and software platform, etc.) | None | Unclear and inappropriate | Fairly clear and appropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | 20 | | |
| Report Quality | | | | | | | | |
| Language (spelling, grammar) | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Writing style | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Citation and reference format | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Structure and organisation | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 100 | | |
| <i>Originality assessment by the supervisor: _____ (based on the Turnitin report). Comments (to be continued on additional pages if necessary):</i> | | | | | | | | |

Evaluator: _____ (Name)

_____ (Signature)

Date: _____

Assessment Rubric for MGPO4100 Study Report (Approach B)

Project Title:

Student Names:

| Assessment Criterion | Level of Comprehensiveness (Please mark the level achieved for each criterion) | | | | | Full Mark | Level Achieved | Mark Given |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|------------|----------------|------------|
| | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Introduction | | | | | | 5 | | |
| Purpose, scope, and value of the study | Not defined | Poorly defined | Given | Given and defined | Given and clearly defined | | | |
| Background and Problem Definition | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Background of the study | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| Problem definition | Not defined | Poorly defined | Given | Given and defined | Given and clearly defined | | | |
| Rationale of the study | Not given | Vaguely given | Given | Given and justified | Given and well justified | | | |
| Intellectual Framework and Literature Review | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Review of previous influential studies | Missing | Unclear and insufficient | Unclear or insufficient | Clear and sufficient | Very clear and extensive | | | |
| Key concept definitions | Missing | Few concepts are defined | Some concepts are defined | Key concepts are defined | Key concepts are well defined | | | |
| Theoretical framework/model | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| Design and Methodology of the Study | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Study flow and procedure | Missing | Unclear and inappropriate | Unclear or inappropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Sampling and data collection | No description | Vague description | Fairly clear description | Clear description | Very clear description | | | |
| Instruments and techniques employed | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| Data analysis methods | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| Software Tool Development | | | | | | 15 | | |
| Documentation (clarity and completeness) | Missing | Unclear and insufficient | Unclear or insufficient | Clear and sufficient | Very clear and extensive | | | |
| Prototype of the tool (utility, functionality, and usability) | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Report Quality | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Language (spelling, grammar) | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Writing style | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Citation and reference format | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Structure and organisation | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 100 | | |
| <i>Originality assessment by the supervisor: _____ (based on the Turnitin report). Comments (to be continued on additional pages if necessary):</i> | | | | | | | | |

Evaluator: _____ (Name)

_____ (Signature)

Date: _____

Assessment Rubric for MGPO4100 Oral Presentation (Approach A)

Project Title:

Student Names:

| Assessment Criterion | Level of Comprehensiveness (Please mark the level achieved for each criterion) | | | | | Full Mark | Level Achieved | Mark Given |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|------------|----------------|------------|
| | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Target Market/Organisation | | | | | | 5 | | |
| Background of the market/organisation | Not presented | Poorly presented and described | Briefly presented and described | Appropriately presented and described | Clearly presented and well described | | | |
| Business Analysis and E-Business Initiative | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Business analysis with analytical model(s) | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| E-business initiative | Not defined | Poorly defined | Given | Given and defined | Given and clearly defined | | | |
| Feasibility analysis of the initiative | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | 20 | | |
| Requirements Specification | | | | | | | | |
| Functional requirements gathered | None | Irrelevant and inadequate | Somewhat relevant but inadequate | Relevant and adequate | Relevant, adequate, and comprehensive | | | |
| Non-functional requirements gathered | None | Irrelevant and inadequate | Somewhat relevant but inadequate | Relevant and adequate | Relevant, adequate, and comprehensive | | | |
| Use of specification notations and formats | None | Inaccurate and inappropriate | Somewhat accurate and appropriate | Accurate and appropriate | Very accurate and appropriate | 35 | | |
| System Design | | | | | | | | |
| Mapping of requirements to design | None | Unclear and inappropriate | Fairly clear and appropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Data design (structure of the information system) | None | Inadequate and inappropriate | Somewhat adequate and appropriate | Adequate and appropriate | Adequate, appropriate, and comprehensive | | | |
| Process design (behaviour of the information system) | None | Inadequate and inappropriate | Somewhat adequate and appropriate | Adequate and appropriate | Adequate, appropriate, and comprehensive | | | |
| User interface design (user experience) | None | Unclear and inappropriate | Fairly clear and appropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Use of design notations and format | None | Inaccurate and inappropriate | Somewhat accurate and appropriate | Accurate and appropriate | Very accurate and appropriate | 20 | | |
| Others (system architecture, hardware and software platform, etc.) | None | Unclear and inappropriate | Fairly clear and appropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Oral Presentation | | | | | | | | |
| Communication skills | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | 20 | | |
| Visual aids | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Response to questions | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 100 | | |
| <i>Comments (to be continued on additional pages if necessary):</i> | | | | | | | | |

Evaluator: _____ (Name) _____ (Signature) Date: _____

Assessment Rubric for MGPO4100 Oral Presentation (Approach B)

Project Title:

Student Names:

| Assessment Criterion | Level of Comprehensiveness (Please mark the level achieved for each criterion) | | | | | Full Mark | Level Achieved | Mark Given |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|---------------|----------------|------------|
| | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Introduction | | | | | | 5 | | |
| Purpose, scope, and value of the study | Not defined | Poorly defined | Given | Given and defined | Given and clearly defined | | | |
| Background and Problem Definition | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Background of the study | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| Problem definition | Not defined | Poorly defined | Given | Given and defined | Given and clearly defined | | | |
| Rationale of the study | Not given | Vaguely given | Given | Given and justified | Given and well justified | | | |
| Intellectual Framework and Literature Review | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Review of previous influential studies | Missing | Unclear and insufficient | Unclear or insufficient | Clear and sufficient | Very clear and extensive | | | |
| Key concept definitions | Missing | Few concepts are defined | Some concepts are defined | Key concepts are defined | Key concepts are well defined | | | |
| Theoretical framework/model | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| Design and Methodology of the Study | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Study flow and procedure | Missing | Unclear and inappropriate | Unclear or inappropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Sampling and data collection | No description | Vague description | Fairly clear description | Clear description | Very clear description | | | |
| Instruments and techniques employed | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| Data analysis methods | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| Software Tool Development | | | | | | 15 | | |
| Documentation (clarity and completeness) | Missing | Unclear and insufficient | Unclear or insufficient | Clear and sufficient | Very clear and extensive | | | |
| Prototype of the tool (utility, functionality, and usability) | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Oral Presentation | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Communication skills | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Visual aids | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Response to questions | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Comments (to be continued on additional pages if necessary): | | | | | | Total: | | 100 |

Evaluator: _____ (Name) _____ (Signature) Date: _____

Assessment Rubric for MGPO4110 Study Report (Approach A)

Project Title:

Student Names:

| Assessment Criterion | Level of Comprehensiveness (Please mark the level achieved for each criterion) | | | | | Full Mark | Level Achieved | Mark Given |
|--|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------|----------------|------------|
| | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Abstract | | | | | | 10 | | |
| Concise description of the development project | Not presented | Poorly presented | Briefly presented | Appropriately presented | Clearly presented | | | |
| Inclusion of Report I | | | | | | 10 | | |
| Completeness and content updated (%) | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Implementation | | | | | | 35 | | |
| Documentation of system implementation (% completeness) | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Documentation of system implementation (clarity) | None | Unclear and inappropriate | Fairly clear and appropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Functionality of the information system | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Utility of the information system | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Usability of the information system | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Coding standards | Not followed | Rarely followed | Followed occasionally | Followed appropriately | Followed appropriately and extensively | | | |
| Test | | | | | | 15 | | |
| Test plans | Not presented | Poorly presented and described | Briefly presented and described | Appropriately presented and described | Clearly presented and well described | | | |
| Test cases and results | Not presented | Poorly presented and described | Briefly presented and described | Appropriately presented and described | Clearly presented and well described | | | |
| Documentation | | | | | | 10 | | |
| User manual | None | Unclear and insufficient | Unclear or insufficient | Fairly clear and sufficient | Very clear and sufficient | | | |
| Report Quality | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Language (spelling, grammar) | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Writing style | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Citation and reference format | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Structure and organisation | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 100 | | |
| <i>Originality assessment by the supervisor: _____ (based on the Turnitin report). Comments (to be continued on additional pages if necessary):</i> | | | | | | | | |

Evaluator: _____ (Name) _____ (Signature) Date: _____

Assessment Rubric for MGPO4110 Study Report (Approach B)

Project Title:

Student Names:

| Assessment Criterion | Level of Comprehensiveness (Please mark the level achieved for each criterion) | | | | | Full Mark | Level Achieved | Mark Given |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|------------|----------------|------------|
| | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Abstract | | | | | | 10 | | |
| Concise description of the investigation project | Not presented | Poorly presented | Briefly presented | Appropriately presented | Clearly presented | | | |
| Inclusion of Report I | | | | | | 10 | | |
| Completeness and content updated (%) | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Results and Findings | | | | | | 35 | | |
| Execution of the methodology | Missing | Inappropriate and unclear | Somewhat appropriate but unclear | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Sample data | Not presented | Irrelevant and inadequate | Somewhat relevant but inadequate | Relevant and adequate | Relevant, adequate, and comprehensive | | | |
| Data analysis process | Not presented | Inappropriate and inadequate | Somewhat appropriate but inadequate | Appropriate and adequate | Appropriate, adequate, and sophisticated | | | |
| Results from data analyses | Not presented | Inaccurate and incompletely presented | Presented correctly, but with inaccurate explanation | Presented correctly with accurate explanation | Presented correctly with accurate and detailed explanation | | | |
| Discussions and Implications | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Interpretation of the findings | Not presented | Findings are interpreted superficially | Findings are somewhat interpreted | Findings are interpreted | Findings are well interpreted | | | |
| Discussion and implications | Not presented | Not relevant and not discussed | Relevant, but not adequately discussed | Relevant and adequately discussed | Very relevant and thoroughly discussed | | | |
| Recommendations and limitations | Not presented | Not relevant | Relevant, but not adequately described | Relevant and adequately described | Very relevant and fully described | | | |
| Conclusion | | | | | | 5 | | |
| Main points of the study are recapped | None | Unclear and irrelevant | Fairly clear and relevant | Clear and relevant | Very clear and relevant | | | |
| Report Quality | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Language (spelling, grammar) | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Writing style | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Citation and reference format | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Structure and organisation | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 100 | | |
| <i>Originality assessment by the supervisor: _____ (based on the Turnitin report). Comments (to be continued on additional pages if necessary): _____</i> | | | | | | | | |

Evaluator: _____ (Name) _____ (Signature) Date: _____

Assessment Rubric for MGPO4110 Oral Presentation (Approach A)

Project Title:

Student Names:

| Assessment Criterion | Level of Comprehensiveness (Please mark the level achieved for each criterion) | | | | | Full Mark | Level Achieved | Mark Given |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|------------|----------------|------------|
| | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Background of the system implementation (from Report I) | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Market/Organisation and the E-business initiative | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| User requirements and system specification | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| System Implementation | | | | | | 35 | | |
| Documentation of system implementation (% completeness) | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Documentation of system implementation (clarity) | None | Unclear and inappropriate | Fairly clear and appropriate | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Functionality of the information system | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Utility of the information system | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Usability of the I information system | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Coding standards | Not followed | Rarely followed | Followed occasionally | Followed appropriately | Followed appropriately and extensively | | | |
| Test | | | | | | 15 | | |
| Test plans | Not presented | Poorly presented and described | Briefly presented and described | Appropriately presented and described | Clearly presented and well described | | | |
| Test cases and results | Not presented | Poorly presented and described | Briefly presented and described | Appropriately presented and described | Clearly presented and well described | | | |
| Documentation | | | | | | 10 | | |
| User manual | None | Unclear and insufficient | Unclear or insufficient | Fairly clear and sufficient | Very clear and sufficient | | | |
| Oral Presentation | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Communication skills | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Visual aids | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Response to questions | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | 100 | | |
| <i>Comments (to be continued on additional pages if necessary):</i> | | | | | | | | |

Evaluator: _____ (Name) _____ (Signature) Date: _____

Assessment Rubric for MGPO4110 Oral Presentation (Approach B)

Project Title:

Student Names:

| Assessment Criterion | Level of Comprehensiveness (Please mark the level achieved for each criterion) | | | | | Full Mark | Level Achieved | Mark Given |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|---------------|----------------|------------|
| | 0 (0% - 29%) | 1 (30% - 49%) | 2 (50% - 69%) | 3 (70% - 89%) | 4 (90% - 100%) | | | |
| Background of the investigation work (from Report I) | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Background and problem definition | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | | | |
| Intellectual framework and/or model; Methodology | Not presented | Vaguely presented and not discussed | Presented, but not adequately discussed | Presented and somewhat adequately discussed | Clearly presented and adequately discussed | 35 | | |
| Findings and Results of the Investigation | | | | | | | | |
| Execution of the methodology | Missing | Inappropriate and unclear | Somewhat appropriate but unclear | Clear and appropriate | Very clear and appropriate | | | |
| Sample data | Not presented | Irrelevant and inadequate | Somewhat relevant but inadequate | Relevant and adequate | Relevant, adequate, and comprehensive | | | |
| Data analysis process | Not presented | Inappropriate and inadequate | Somewhat appropriate but inadequate | Appropriate and adequate | Appropriate, adequate, and sophisticated | | | |
| Results from data analyses | Not presented | Inaccurate and incompletely presented | Presented correctly, but with inaccurate explanation | Presented correctly with accurate explanation | Presented correctly with accurate and detailed explanation | | | |
| Discussions and Implications | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Interpretation of the findings | Not presented | Findings are interpreted superficially | Findings are somewhat interpreted | Findings are interpreted | Findings are well interpreted | | | |
| Discussion and implications | Not presented | Not relevant and not discussed | Relevant, but not adequately discussed | Relevant and adequately discussed | Very relevant and thoroughly discussed | | | |
| Recommendations and limitations | Not presented | Not relevant | Relevant, but not adequately described | Relevant and adequately described | Very relevant and fully described | 5 | | |
| Conclusion | | | | | | | | |
| Main points of the study are recapped | None | Unclear and irrelevant | Fairly clear and relevant | Clear and relevant | Very clear and relevant | | | |
| Oral Presentation | | | | | | 20 | | |
| Communication skills | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Visual aids | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | | | |
| Response to questions | Very poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | Total: | 100 | |
| <i>Comments (to be continued on additional pages if necessary):</i> | | | | | | | | |

Evaluator: _____ (Name) _____ (Signature) Date: _____

**Graduation Report (MGPO4100/4110)
Project Schedule
First and Second Semesters, 2023/24**

| Milestone/Deadline | Date | |
|--|--|-----------|
| MGPO4100 (Graduation Report I) | 1. Submission of each team's Graduation Report proposal to the supervisor, consisting of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a list of the students in the team (2 to 3 students each), • the Graduation Report's topic, and • the chosen approach option (i.e., approach A or approach B) | x/9/2023 |
| | 2. The supervisor's announcement of the School's approval/rejection of the Graduation Report proposal and the follow-up actions in case of rejection | x/9/2023 |
| | 3. Oral presentation* of each team for Report I | x/11/2023 |
| | 4. Submission of the following to the supervisor by each team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One hard copy of the Study Report[†] for Report I • CD(s), DVD(s), or USB drive(s) containing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one soft copy of the Study Report for Report I and • for approach B only, the software tool developed, including all source codes, compiled codes, etc. • The list of students' individual contributions to Report I • All the progress logs for the meetings with the supervisor throughout the first semester | x/11/2022 |
| MGPO4110 (Graduation Report II) | 5. Oral presentation* of each team for Report II | x/4/2024 |
| | 6. Submission of the following to the supervisor by each team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Two</u> hard copies of the Study Report[†] for Report II • CD(s), DVD(s), or USB drive(s) containing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one soft copy of the Study Report for Report II; • for approach A, a fully operational version of the information system, inclusive of all programmes (i.e., all source codes, compiled codes, and the like), all databases, and all other files enabling the installation and execution of the system; and • for approach B, the software tool developed in the first semester (including all source codes, compiled codes, etc.), all data collected, and all other files enabling the regeneration of the results and findings of the study • The list of students' individual contributions to Report II • All the progress logs for the meetings with the supervisor throughout the second semester | x/4/2024 |

* The oral presentation will last 30 minutes, including a 10-minute question and answer session.

[†] The written report should be printed on A4 plain white paper using 12-pt Times New Roman, double-spacing, and leaving a 1" margin on all four sides.

Bachelor of E-Commerce Programme

MGPO4100 Graduation Report I First Semester, 2023/24

Progress Log

Students' Names: _____

Supervisor's Name: _____

Topic: _____

| Meeting No. _____ | Planned Outcome | Outcome Met (✓): | | |
|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|----|
| | | Yes | Partially | No |
| Date: / / ____ | | | | |
| 1 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| Supervisor's Comments: | | | | |

Please duplicate this page as necessary.

Bachelor of E-Commerce Programme

MGPO4110 Graduation Report II Second Semester, 2023/24

Progress Log

Students' Names: _____

Supervisor's Name: _____

Topic: _____

| Meeting No. Date: / / _ _ _ | Planned Outcome | Outcome Met (✓): | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|----|
| | | Yes | Partially | No |
| 1 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | |
| Supervisor's Comments: | | | | |

Please duplicate this page as necessary.