CMPG323 – Functional & Technical Specification Rubric

[Total: 100 marks]   **FINAL MARK:** _____

Markers: Use the guidance notes under each section to check coverage. The marker guidance notes are merely a "guide" however as we know, each Project may or may not directly relate to the guide, however the criterion should be a better benchmark on which to evaluate. Use your own professional judgment from what you already know / have learned from Information Systems Engineering and IT development in general.

- Functional Specification = 45%
- Technical Specification = 45%
- Presentation & Impression = 10%

1. Functional Specification   **[45 marks]**

(Evaluation of how well the system's functions are defined, structured, and aligned with project goals.)

Criteria	Marks	Missing (0–24%)	Somewhat met (25–49%)	Met (50–74%)	Exceeded (75–100%)	Mark allocation
System Objectives & Scope	10	_No clear scope or objectives._	_Objectives vague; scope incomplete._	_Clear objectives with defined scope._	_Comprehensive, well-aligned scope & objectives showing strong understanding._	
User Requirements (Use Cases / User Stories)	15	_Missing or poorly defined._	Some requirements unclear or inconsistent.	Requirements clear, complete, and logical.	_Requirements are detailed, prioritized, and validated against project goals._	
Functional Requirements (What the system should do)	20	_No/very limited functions listed._	_Incomplete or inconsistent functions._	_Clear, structured list of functional requirements._	_Comprehensive, well-structured, traceable functions (with validation criteria)._	
					Total:	

2. Technical Specification   [45 marks]

(Evaluation of system architecture, tools, technology stack, and implementation constraints.)

Criteria	Marks	Missing (0–24%)	Somewhat met (25–49%)	Met (50–74%)	Exceeded (75–100%)	Mark allocation
System Architecture & Design	15	*Missing or unclear.*	*Partial or vague architecture description.*	*Clear architecture diagrams/design.*	*Detailed architecture with rationale & strong design principles.*	
Technology Stack & Tools	10	*No mention of tech stack/tools.*	*Listed but not justified.*	*Clearly defined stack with some justification.*	*Well-justified, realistic, and aligned to project goals.*	
Technical Requirements & Constraints	10	*Not addressed.*	*Vague or incomplete.*	*Clearly defined technical requirements (e.g., performance, security).*	*Comprehensive, prioritized, with trade-offs discussed.*	
Integration & Data Considerations	10	*Not addressed.*	*Limited discussion of integration/data.*	*Integration and data requirements clearly described.*	*Strong integration plan with considerations for scalability, data flow & storage.*	
					Total:	

3. Presentation of Documentation, Professionalism & Impression   [10 marks]

(Evaluates clarity, formatting, and overall professional delivery.)

Criteria	Marks	Missing (0–24%)	Somewhat met (25–49%)	Met (50–74%)	Exceeded (75–100%)	Mark allocation
Clarity, Formatting & Professionalism	10	*Poorly structured, unclear.*	*Minimal effort, formatting inconsistent.*	*Clear, professional, easy to follow.*	*Highly polished, professional, visually effective, and creates strong impression.*	
					Total:	