

Marking Rubric Deliverable 2

Deliverable Level Criteria

Structure and Organisation

Exceeding Expectations: The deliverable is meticulously organised with a clear, logical flow that enhances readability and understanding. Each section follows the recommended guidelines from applied/workshops, with appropriate headings and subheadings that reflect the content accurately. Transitions between sections are seamless, creating a cohesive and engaging narrative that naturally guides the reader through the document. The structure supports the document's purpose, making it accessible for different stakeholders, e.g., team project members from other groups and non-technical users.

Meeting Expectations: The document is organised with a clear and logical flow. Each section follows the recommended guidelines from applied/workshops, with appropriate headings and subheadings that reflect the content accurately. Transitions between sections are smooth, ensuring that the document is easy to navigate and understand. The structure supports the document's purpose, making it accessible for stakeholders, e.g., your team project members.

Unsatisfactory: Insufficient evidence to meet all the expectations for the structure and organisation of the deliverable.

Rationale: A well-structured deliverable ensures clear communication with stakeholders/readers, making it easier for them to engage with the deliverable. This clarity is crucial for aligning the project team and stakeholders/readers, ensuring that everyone understands the project's goals and how they will be achieved. This deliverable lays the foundation for all future project work and communication.

Relevance

Exceeding Expectations: The deliverable exhibits exceptional relevance to the project idea, with the deliverable and sections not only connected to the overall project goals but also contributing meaningfully to the development and communication of the project's vision. The content across all sections is complete and meticulously aligned, with a clear and deliberate connection between the problem statement, stakeholder analysis, requirements, and design components.

Meeting Expectations: The deliverable exhibits relevance to the project idea, with the deliverable and sections not only connected to the overall project goals but also contributing meaningfully to the development and communication of the project's vision. The content across all sections is complete and aligned, with a clear connection between the problem statement, stakeholder analysis, requirements, and design components.

Unsatisfactory: Insufficient evidence to meet all the expectations for the relevance and alignment of the deliverable, including incomplete parts.

Rationale: Ensuring relevance and alignment within the deliverable is crucial for maintaining a clear and consistent focus on the project's objectives. A well-aligned deliverable helps project team and stakeholders/readers see how each part contributes to the overall project, making it easier for them to understand, support, and engage with the project. This consistency not only strengthens communication but also ensures that all team members are working towards the same goals, which is vital for the successful development and implementation of the system.

Section Level Criteria

Depth of Analysis

Exceeding Expectations: The section provides a comprehensive analysis that demonstrates a clear understanding of the key aspects relevant to the project and the guidelines for the section (e.g., problem statement) discussed in the applied/workshop. The analysis goes beyond the basic requirements, offering critical evaluations, well-supported arguments, and thoughtful justifications. Examples (where necessary) are used strategically to strengthen the analysis, providing clear and compelling insights that not only address the requirements of each section but also enhance the project's development and stakeholder understanding.

Meeting Expectations: The section provides a solid analysis that demonstrates a clear understanding of the key aspects relevant to the project and the guidelines for the section (e.g., problem statement) discussed in the applied/workshop. The analysis includes well-reasoned arguments and justifications, supported by appropriate examples or data where applicable.

Unsatisfactory: Insufficient evidence to meet all the expectations and weak/shallow analysis.

Rationale: Depth of analysis is critical in ensuring that the section provides valuable insights that inform the project's direction and decisions. A well-developed analysis demonstrates the team's ability to critically evaluate options and justify choices. This level of insight is essential for creating a deliverable that effectively supports the project's success and ensures that team members/stakeholders can make informed contributions to the project.

MARKING GUIDE + GUIDELINES

Marking Split

Section	Marks
Class Diagram	7.5
Sequence Diagrams	10
Usability Evaluation	7.5
QA Plan - Unit Testing + Functional Testing	20
Implementation	50
Deliverable 1 Updates	5

The deliverable will be graded using the split, the guidelines and “depth of analysis” criteria of each section, and based on meeting/not meeting the deliverable-level criteria. It is not a direct sum of the individual parts, as these are indicative for the weights of different sections. The final scores are only individual team member scores, that will be calculated based on the interviews, quality of the deliverable and the individual contributions to the deliverables.

Class Diagram

- The diagram is clear, without inconsistencies, and follows UML standard
- All relevant classes/concepts are represented
- Correctly includes relationships like associations, aggregations, compositions, and inheritance where applicable

Sequence Diagrams [one per team member]

- Diagram covers essential interactions with 3-4 lifelines
- All interactions are correctly represented and are complete, and the lifelines are clear
- Accurate sequence logic

Usability Evaluation

- Coverage of all usability heuristics and their application in critically analysing the group's software interface.
- Robust user testing, with well-thought-out scenarios/tasks for think aloud task.
- Evaluation findings presented in a structured manner, highlighting areas of success and potential improvements.

Quality Assurance Plan

- Comprehensive QA strategy that effectively defines the scope and coverage of the code for testing the software but also encompasses a diverse range of test scenarios to address all functional and non-functional requirements.
- High quality unit tests covering both positive and negative scenarios, and tackling edge cases and potential pitfalls.
- The functional testing aspect of the plan should ensure that the functional requirements are thoroughly verified with well-structured end-to-end test scenarios.

Implementation

- MVP features are implemented and functional, with at least two user roles (might vary for smaller groups)
- All key features (defined in the requirements) are present and working as expected.
- Code runs without crashes, errors, or major bugs.
- Code is clean, well-structured, and well commented.
- Clear and meaningful variable, function, and class names.
- Appropriate error handling is present in sections of the code.
- Code is organised in a logical structure (e.g., related to software architecture)