	Student 1	Michael Wijaya									
	Student 2	Carrick							Feedback	V	
CLO	Assessment Area		Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Marks	Marks	1		
CLO1	Introduction to Design Document	3			V		2		Architectural Design	insufficient / not clearly defined / irrelevant / not found	
	Architectural Design								_		
	- Site Map [2] 2										
	- Design Class Diagram[2] 2								System Design	insufficient / not clearly defined / irrelevant / not found	
	-System Sequence Diagram + Contracts[2]2	6				√	6	. 6			
	Data Design[3] 3								Data/Modules design	incomplete / lack in labelling / inconsistent notation / poor / not found	
	Database/File Design[3] 2	6			√		5	. 9	Data/Modules design	incomplete / sack in labelling / inconsistent notation / poor / not found	
	Wire frames	5				√	4.5	4.5	Wireframes	poor / lack in commonality or metaphor / inconsistent / not found	
CLO1	Test objectives (Iteration 1)	3	. √			√	0		Tests objectives	not clearly defined / insufficient / lacking in proper labelling/not found	
	Test Plan								Test methods, specs.	not clearly defined / insufficient / not found	
	Schedule	2				√	2	2	rest methods, specs.	not clearly defined / insurficient / not round	
	Unit Testing	4				√	4	. 4	Tests results	not clearly defined / insufficient / not found/Did not use any tools not clearly defined / insufficient / not found	
	Integration Testing	3				V	3	3	Tests analysis report		
	System (func and nonfunc)	5				V	4.5	4.5	1		
	Tests analysis report	3				V	3	. 3			
		ĺ						,	Spelling/Grammar	spelling mistakes/sentences are not comprehensible/sentences too long	
CLO3	Documentation (Design and Testing)										
	Format Consistency/Spelling/Grammar								Format	table of contents not found/inconsistent font size/no proper headings	
	Professionalism	5			al		4				
	Project Management [5]	3			4		4	4	+		
CLO2	Gantt Chart								Gantt Chart	not found/no comparison with baseline/no reflection/poor reflection	
CLOZ	- duite chare	5				√	5		Cant Cant	not round to comparison was outside no reflection poor reflection	
CLO3	Presentation	10					8.29	8.29	1		
							0.20	-			
CLO1	Peer Evaluation	10			V		8		Peer Evaluation	Did not evaluate/irrelevant answers/incomplete	
	Application operation success rate [3+4+3]								Ī		
	System functional/partialy functional /not										
	working 3								Prototype	did not meet functional req/did not meet non functional req/not working/	
	Adequacy of the levels of complexity of the										
	design3										
CLOI	Validations in place 3/2	10				V	9	8	-		
	Quality of software produced [5+5] • fulfilment of requirements/objectives 5				1					Poor design of screen layouts/poor interaction or navigation/difficult to u	
	usability (UX and ease of use 4	10			1	J	9			r oor design or screen ayours poor interaction or navigation/difficult to us	
	Collaboration via Git[10]	10			1	*	9	3	+		
	-setup/push/pull/branch/merge (evidence of				1				Use of GIT	no evidence of use/minimum use	
	collaboration) 2 2 1 2 1	10			√		8				
	. ,			1	1			1	Ť		
	Late Submission 5 marks per day (days)								1		
	TOTAL	100					85.29	84.29	·		

ORGANISATION (20 POINTS)	Student 1	Student 2					
Introduction included name of presenter(s), aim and objectives in letration 1 or 2 Structure/Organisation of slides Concluded with Gant chart/git hub and next iteration	No introduction, no title of project, poorly structured slides No updates on Gantt chart and Github	-liatroduction to team members, project and aim stated Poor structured slides -No clear updates on Gantt chart and Github	Introduction to team members, project and aim stated "Well structured slides -Unclear and poorly defined updates on Gantt chart and Github	-A good start on the introduction of members	•A good start on the introduction of members •Well structured slides •Clear and well defined updates on Gantt chart and Github showcasing the usage	4	4
EFFECTIVENESS IN COVERING OBJECTIVES (40 points)							
Oral Presentation	-Presenter struggled in the presentation with poor voice projection -Communication of the main idea was broken and hard to follow.	*Communication of the idea was broken and hard to follow. *Voice projection was low with several mispronounced words, or "um's" and "fikes", "lah"	Relatively interesting, rehearsed with a fairly smooth delivery that usually holds audience attention. Voice projection was adequate with very few mispronounced words, or "um's" and "likes", "lah".	Delivery was clear. -Communication of ideas was good. - Voice projection was good	•Presenter was passionate about the topic, energetic, relaxed, and confident, with a clear delivery. •Presentation was well-reheased and well paced	3	3
Navigation, Buttons, Clicks	•Links, Buttons and Clicks don't work at all	Links seem to missing and don't allow the ready to easily navigate. -Some Buttons and Clicks not working properly	•Einks allow the user to move from page to page, but some links seem to be missing •Some Buttons and Clicks not working properly	Links are labelled and allow the user to easily move from page to page. Buttons and Clicks are working properly	•Links, Buttons and Clicks are clearly labelled, consistently placed, and allow the user to easily move from page to page.	5	5
Website covers core product functions stated in Iteration 1 or 2 as per the use cases, SSD and contracts	•Not functioning as per the requirement	•Minimal functionalities are working as per the expanded use case, SSD and contracts	 Only half of the functionalities are working as per the expanded use case. SSD and 	•Most of the functionalities are working as per the expanded use case, SSD and contracts	•All Functionalities are working as per the expanded use case, SSD and contracts	5	5
UX design is consistent with principles of UX design	Website has randomly chosen elements throughout. More than three fonts are used within the website.	Website has randomly chosen elements throughout. More than three fonts are used within the website.	Website uses a colour scheme, but not all pages are the same. Less than three fonts are used within the website.	•Website has a colour scheme. •Less than three fonts are used.	*Website uses a consistent colour scheme throughout the website. *Less than three fonts are used and they consistently highlight titles and have readable content.	4	4
Website has an attractive and usable layout	*Use of elements detracts from presentation. •Graphics, colour schemes, transitions, and backgrounds disrupt flow.	Little evidence of original thinking. Minimal use of design elements. Lots of text, little use of other elements such as graphics or pictures.	•Good use of graphics and/or other design elements. •Evidence of originality and creativity enhance the content presented	Excellent sense of creativity and design. Graphic elements enhance and support the presentation of content.	•Product shows a large amount of original thought. •Ideas are creative and innovative.	4	4
Validations in place	•No validations found	•Random and basic validations found	•Validations are placed in some data entry fields to avoid mistakes by user	•Validations are realistically placed thoroughly in the data entry forms	•Website data entry forms have been designed intuitively to validate data entry	4	4
					35	29	29
					Weightage (/10)	8.29	8.29

All Functionalities work

duplication of objectives word by word in another report

Need to slow down