## WBCS017-10 SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

This document presents the Deliverables (Ds) based on Learning Outcomes (LOs) to be delivered in each of the Assessment Blocks (ABs). Marking criteria for each D are presented below.

The WBCS017-10 Software Engineering course has the following Learning Outcomes:

Learning Outcomes (LO)		
ID	Description	
LO1	have an in-depth knowledge of the initial phases of the software engineering lifecycle, i.e. requirements engineering and be able to apply them in a large-scale industrial setting	
LO2	have an in-depth knowledge of the software design phase and be able to apply them in a large-scale industrial setting	
LO3	comprehend the needs of an external client taking into account their cultural and professional background	
LO4	communicate and negotiate effectively possibilities and limitations of a product taking into account the broader socio-ethical context of the problem.	
LO5	have knowledge about collaborative software development and its implications in time management, and project management (e.g. task sharing, agile practices)	
LO6	have knowledge about the basic required technologies in a collaborative environment (e.g. distributed version control, continuous integration)	
LO7	have knowledge about how to maintain a high level of quality of the software even when the project becomes large, by writing clean code and good documentation	

The following are the Deliverables of the WBCS017-10 Software Engineering course, and linked to Learning Outcomes

Deliverables (D)		
ID	Description	Learning Outcomes
D1	Describe, justify and contextualise the requirements of the system	LO1, LO3, LO4
D2	Produce the design documentation for the system	LO2, LO4
D3	Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP) and demo (block I)	LO1, LO5, LO6
D4	Final demo of the system and presentation of work (block II)	LO4, LO6
D5	Source code for release candidate	LO5, LO6, LO7
D6	Traceability Matrix	LO3, LO4, LO7

Assessment Blocks (AB)				
ID	When	Deliverables	Grade	
AB1	End of block I	D1, D2, D3	(D1+D2+D3)/3	
AB2	End of block II	D1, D2, D4, D5, D6	(D1 + D2 + D4 + D5 + D6)/5	
FG*		Final Grade	(AB1 + AB2)/2	

<sup>\*</sup> Pass threshold for course: **FG** >= **5.5** (no pass threshold for either AB1 or AB2)

Marking Criteria	
D1: Describe, justify and contextualise the requirements of the system	Mark and Mark
Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO3 and LO4	Descriptor

uery poor attempt at approaching the requirements report. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of requirement unique identifiers, their priority levels or a clear rationale conceptually weak, revealing insufficient grasp of the requirements of the client. Overall a poor analysis of the system and its requirements. Recognisable but limited awareness of the rationale of the requirements specific to the system under investigation. Threshold requirements in the system. The requirements have been uniquely identified, prioritised and discussed with the client.  The criteria for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a sound analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding 'Requirements development.  The criteria for analysis' has been analysed and discussed in the context of the system under development.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  22. Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO3  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can be play for the propert growides and overall poor analysis of the architectural the propert is considered to the connectors in a meaningful way.  The shold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identificatio		
example, the absence of requirement unique identifiers, their priority levels or a clear rationale Conceptually weak, revealing insufficient grasp of the requirements of the client. Overall a poor analysis of the system and its requirements. Recognisable but limited awareness of the rationale of the requirements percent from the system under investigation.  The criteria for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a good/very distinction and analysis and is usel organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or conditions and analysis and is used or reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  Packing Jernary Border and the core or or or or or obvious or an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  Grade and Grad	In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this part of the report demonstrates a	1-2
Authoritised by a system and its requirements. Recognisable but limited awareness of the rationale of the requirements specific to the system under investigation.  Threshold requirements: The requirement Recognisable but limited awareness of the rationale of the requirements specific to the system under investigation.  Threshold requirements: The requirement document provides a satisfactory analysis of the current requirements of the system. The requirements have been uniquely identified, prioritised and discussed with the client.  The criteria for an "Acceptable" grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a sound analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding "Requirements the interaction and analysis" has been analysed and discussed in the context of the system under development.  The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  102: Produce the design documentation for the system  103: Produce the design documentation for the system of the criteria indicated for "unsatisfactory", the design document demonstrates a wery poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can belp identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural diagrams is bound be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  154  155  156  157  158  158  159  159  159  159  159  159	very poor attempt at approaching the requirements report. Symptomatic of this can be, for	Unacceptable
Unsatisfactory of the requirements specific to the system under investigation.  Threshold requirements precific to the system under investigation.  Threshold requirements for the system. The requirement provides a satisfactory analysis of the current requirements of the system. The requirements have been uniquely identified, prioritised and discussed with the client.  The criteria for an "Acceptable" grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a sound analysis and is well organised, structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding "Requirements development.  The requirements an excellent commentary and discussed in the context of the system under development.  The requirements for a "Good" or "Very Good" grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  Dz. Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO3  In addition to the criteria indicated for "unsatisfactory," the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can be help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for an 'Acceptab	example, the absence of requirement unique identifiers, their priority levels or a clear rationale	
of the requirements pecific to the system under investigation.  Threshold requirements. The requirement document provides a satisfactory analysis of the current requirements of the system. The requirements have been uniquely identified, prioritised and discussed with the client.  For criteria for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a sound analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding "Requirements in consistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding "Requirements development.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  Dz. Produce the design documentation for the system of the properties of the properties of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this part of the report is concentration of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  For equirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In ad	Conceptually weak, revealing insufficient grasp of the requirements of the client. Overall a poor	3-4
Threshold requirements: The requirement document provides a satisfactory analysis of the current requirements of the system. The requirements have been uniquely identified, prioritised and discussed with the client.  The criteria for an "Acceptable" grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a sound analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding, "Requirements decelopment.  The requirements for a "Good" or "Very Good" grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D2: Produce the design documentation for the system  Grade and Grade Descriptors  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the unsatisfactory without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is blacked in the overall architecture. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised? structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant l	analysis of the system and its requirements. Recognisable but limited awareness of the rationale	Unsatisfactory
Acceptable and discussed with the client. The criteria for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a sound analysis and is well organised's structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding "Requirements development. The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D2: Produce the design documentation for the system  Grade and Grade  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4 In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is inked directly to one or several of the requirements. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded	of the requirements specific to the system under investigation.	
and discussed with the client.  The criteria for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a sound analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding "Requirements elicitation and analysis" has been analysed and discussed in the context of the system under development.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  DZ: Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a levery poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural designams is inked directly to one or several of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or a co	<u>Threshold requirements:</u> The requirement document provides a satisfactory analysis of the	5
The criteria for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a sound analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding 'Requirements Good development.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  DZ: Produce the design documentation for the system  Grade and Grade  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a c	current requirements of the system. The requirements have been uniquely identified, prioritised	Acceptable
Good/very Good manalysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding "Requirements elicitation and analysis" has been analysed and discussed in the context of the system under development. The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  **Doz: Produce the design documentation for the system**  **Doz: Produce that establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  **This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural algors and architectural algors and architectural algors and architectural algors and sometic that can be for the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural dagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural dagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural dagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural dadriton, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If returned with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If returned with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided of reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional deg	and discussed with the client.	
inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding "Requirements elicitation and analysis" has been analysed and discussed in the context of the system under development.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D2: Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural algers and architectural dayers and architectural decisions are achieved the system under the diagrams is binked directly to one or several of the requirements. The diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements. For a 'Ceceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Ceceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the rep	The criteria for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the requirements report provides a	6-7
inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, the literature regarding "Requirements delicitation and analysis" has been analysed and discussed in the context of the system under development.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D2: Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a bescriptors are the pidentify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is inked directly to one or several of the requirements. The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides of the chosen architectural diagrams is inked directly to one or several of the requirements. The report provides and the connection of the provides and the connection of the provides and the connection of the report provides and the connection of the report provides and the connection of the report provides and the report provides are connected to the code, in terms of features in the report of the report provides and the report provides		Good/Very
elicitation and analysis" has been analysed and discussed in the context of the system under development.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D2: Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4 in addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural degrees is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural degrees is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural degrees is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides		Good
development. The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  Dz.: Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural diagrams is biased on a precise requirement. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the report conduction in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document syntams of		
demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, ocde and tests via the traceability Exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  DZ: Produce the design documentation for the system  Grade Descriptors  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements. This part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  Grade and Grade Descriptors  Acceptable  Grade and Grade Descriptors  5-4 Acceptable diagra	development.	
demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The requirements have been successfully linked to the design, ocde and tests via the traceability Exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  DZ: Produce the design documentation for the system  Grade Descriptors  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements. This part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  Grade and Grade Descriptors  Acceptable  Grade and Grade Descriptors  5-4 Acceptable diagra	The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report	8-9-10
matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D2: Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagram is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6	demonstrates an excellent commentary and interpretation of the identified Requirements. The	Excellent/
matrix. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree, such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D2: Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements. The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report for the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for report stat achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a pu	requirements have been successfully linked to the design, code and tests via the traceability	
DZ: Produce the design documentation for the system  Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4 In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Ou	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	·
Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report good/ grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report town well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade Descriptors  In addition to the cri		
In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements; This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the exceptional degree such that this part of the report tould lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6 in addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that	D2: Produce the design documentation for the system	Grade and
1-2 Unacceptable very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  Days: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade Descriptors  The addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discuss		Grade
1-2 Unacceptable very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  Days: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade Descriptors  The addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discuss	Covering Learning Outcomes LO2 and LO4	Descriptors
can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural decisions, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publish	In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the design document demonstrates a	1-2
thelp identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the l	very poor attempt at establishing the architecture of the system to be built. Symptomatic of this	Unacceptable
3-4  This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the architectural style of the system. The components are identified but without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is inked directly to one or several of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report of	can be, for example, the absence of one or more diagrams, components or connectors that can	
unsatisfactory without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements. The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report general decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade  Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable during the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is Unsatisfactory, unable to show owne	help identify the main building blocks of the application, and their interactions.	
without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements. The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade  D2: Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code prese	This part of the report is conceptually weak, and there is an overall poor analysis of the	3-4
Acceptable structural components and the connectors in a meaningful way.  Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unsatisfactory.  Threshold requirement	architectural layers and architectural style of the system. The components are identified but	Unsatisfactory
Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade Descriptors  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  The requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	without a clear understanding of where they should be placed in the overall architecture. The	
Threshold requirements: This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown a	diagrams shown do not help to describe the components and the connectors in a meaningful	
Acceptable diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade  Descriptors  1-2  Unacceptable  3-4  Unsatisfactory  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements:  The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	way.	
diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	<u>Threshold requirements:</u> This part of the report provides a satisfactory identification of the	5
of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	architectural components and connectors, together with their description within the design	Acceptable
The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	diagrams of choice. Each of the architectural diagrams is based on a precise requirement. Each	
a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	of the chosen architectural diagrams is linked directly to one or several of the requirements.	
Good document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6 In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report provides	6-7
document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade Descriptors  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	a complete analysis and is well organised/ structured with no major or obvious omissions or	Good/Very
Similar domain.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade Descriptors  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	inconsistencies in the coverage provided. If relevant, relevant literature has been discussed to	Good
The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report demonstrates a <i>complete</i> and <i>correct</i> commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6 In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as <i>high priority</i> in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	document past attempts of the chosen architectural decisions, patterns and style, and in a	
demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline of this part of the report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6 In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  Excellent/ Exceptional  Exceptional  Exceptional  Exceptional  Exceptional  Exceptional  Exceptional	similar domain.	
Exceptional report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition, this part of the report	8-9-10
Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6 In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  Grade and Grade  Descriptors  1-2  Unacceptable  3-4  Unsatisfactory	demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the tonic. The storyline of this part of the	Excellent/
to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  Grade and Grade  Descriptors  1-2  Unacceptable  Unacceptable  3-4  Unsatisfactory	demonstrates a complete and correct commentary on the topic. The storyline or this part of the	
to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Grade and Grade  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  Grade and Grade  Descriptors  1-2  Unacceptable  Unacceptable  3-4  Unsatisfactory	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible <b>alternatives</b> in the realm of	Exceptional
Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6 In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  Grade  Descriptors  1-2  Unacceptable  Unacceptable  3-4  Unsatisfactory		Exceptional
Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6 In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of	Exceptional
In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as <i>high priority</i> in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible <b>alternatives</b> in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards	·
unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  Unacceptable unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Unacceptable unable to show ownership of the code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  3-4  Unacceptable unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible <b>alternatives</b> in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.	Grade and
requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  5	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible <b>alternatives</b> in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.	Grade and Grade
presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  5	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2
the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  5	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2
This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  5	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2
during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  5	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2
unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first  5	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2
Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first 5	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable
part of the course, shows that the features connected with high priority requirements have been   Acceptable	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable
	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory
attempted with acceptable results. The group shows ownership of the code, and knows where	report flows well integrating and commenting on possible alternatives in the realm of architectural decisions. Higher grades will be awarded for reports that achieve these standards to an exceptional degree such that this part of the report could lead to a publishable article.  D3: Source code for Minimum Viable Product (MVP)  Covering Learning Outcomes LO1, LO5 and LO6  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the MVP demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the minimal features that are discussed as high priority in the requirements document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of basic functionalities.  This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features, and it is unable to show ownership of the code, in terms of features implemented.  Threshold requirements: The MVP shown at the demo, and the code developed during the first part of the course, shows that the features connected with high priority requirements have been	Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory

features are lacking refinement, and what other features are missing. A good understanding of	
the remaining work, with a likely timeline of work and responsibilities, is described during the	
demo.	
The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the MVP provides a complete	6-7
list of features either complete, work-in-progress or still to be implemented. The group shows	Good/Very
clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified: the	Good
group can show a credible timeline of work to be performed in the second block.	
The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the MVP shows a	8-9-10
complete and correct set of features (completed, work-in-progress or still to be implemented)	Excellent/
that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for	Exceptional
exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.	
D4: Final demo of the system and presentation of work (block II)	Grade and
	Grade
Covering Learning Outcomes LO4 and LO6	Descriptors
In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', the final demo demonstrates a very poor	1-2
attempt at implementing the features that are discussed in the requirements document.	Unacceptable
Symptomatic of this can be, for example, the lack of runnable code, the presence of bugs that do	
not allow the program to run, or the feedback of the client lamenting the lack of the	
functionalities at the end of the development cycle.	
This deliverable is structurally weak, and there is an overall poor quality of the code presented	3-4
during the demo. The group is unable to define the scope of the missing features and why that	Unsatisfactory
happened during the course of two blocks: the group is also unable to show ownership of the	·
code, in terms of features implemented.	
Threshold requirements: The product shown at the demo, and the code developed during the	5
second part of the course, shows that the features connected with each requirement have been	Acceptable
attempted with acceptable results. The group shows an overall good level of ownership of the	,
code, and knows where features are lacking refinement and why. Clear responsibilities have	
been identified and group members are credited with the work that they implemented .	
The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the final demo provides a	
Title requirements for an Acceptable grade are met, in addition, the final demo provides a	6-7
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features	<b>6-7</b> Good/Very Good
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear	Good/Very
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group	Good/Very
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.	Good/Very
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group	Good/Very Good
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a	Good/Very Good 8-9-10 Excellent/
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher	Good/Very Good 8-9-10 Excellent/
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional Grade and Grade Descriptors
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete,	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  Threshold requirements: The code provided as release candidate is complete, as referred to in	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  Threshold requirements: The code provided as release candidate is complete, as referred to in the final version of the requirements and design documents. The features are linked to the	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  Threshold requirements: The code provided as release candidate is complete, as referred to in the final version of the requirements and design documents. The features are linked to the development of one or multiple members of the group, and the trace of development logs is	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  Threshold requirements: The code provided as release candidate is complete, as referred to in the final version of the requirements and design documents. The features are linked to the development of one or multiple members of the group, and the trace of development logs is complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors 1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  Threshold requirements: The code provided as release candidate is complete, as referred to in the final version of the requirements and design documents. The features are linked to the development of one or multiple members of the group, and the trace of development logs is complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the source code has been	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory  5 Acceptable
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LO5, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  Threshold requirements: The code provided as release candidate is complete, as referred to in the final version of the requirements and design documents. The features are linked to the development of one or multiple members of the group, and the trace of development logs is complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the source code has been delivered regularly to the TA, as part of the sprints that the group worked through. Coding	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory  5 Acceptable
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LOS, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  Threshold requirements: The code provided as release candidate is complete, as referred to in the final version of the requirements and design documents. The features are linked to the development of one or multiple members of the group, and the trace of development logs is complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the source code has been delivered regularly to the TA, as part of the sprints that the group worked through. Coding standards have been consistently adhered to, and documentation provided a	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory  5 Acceptable
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LOS, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  Threshold requirements: The code provided as release candidate is complete, as referred to in the final version of the requirements and design documents. The features are linked to the development of one or multiple members of the group, and the trace of development logs is complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the source code has been delivered regularly to the TA, as part of the sprints that the group worked through. Coding standards have been consistently adhered to, and documentation provided a	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory  5 Acceptable
complete list of the complete features. Work-in-progress or still to be implemented features have been either reduced to a minimum, or discussed with the client. The group shows clear ownership of the code, responsibilities of coding and features are clearly identified. The group can show a credible timeline of work that has been completed in the second term.  The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the final demo shows a complete and correct set of features that are directly traceable to the design document. Higher grades will be awarded for exceptional presentations during the demo sessions.  D5: Source code for release candidate  Covering Learning Outcomes LOS, LO6 and LO7  In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at implementing the desired features. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of coding standards or documentation, incomplete features or incomplete traceability. The trace of development logs is incomplete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  This deliverable only partially adheres to coding standards and does not provide sufficient documentation. The features are incomplete and there are issues in running the code outside of the environment used by the group. The trace of development logs is only partially complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  Threshold requirements: The code provided as release candidate is complete, as referred to in the final version of the requirements and design documents. The features are linked to the development of one or multiple members of the group, and the trace of development logs is complete, especially in the definition of the development activities.  The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the source code has been delivered regularly to the TA, as part of the sprints that the group worked through. Coding standards have been consistently adhered to, and documentation provided a	Good/Very Good  8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional  Grade and Grade Descriptors  1-2 Unacceptable  3-4 Unsatisfactory  5 Acceptable

The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition the TA responsible for the group reports an excellent level of performance of the coding activities during the sprints of the two terms.	8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional
D6: Traceability Matrix  Covering Learning Outcomes LO3, LO4 and LO7	Grade and Grade Descriptors
In addition to the criteria indicated for 'unsatisfactory', this deliverable demonstrates a very poor attempt at linking the development activities, tests and requirements in a single document. Symptomatic of this can be, for example, lack of unique identifiers, wrong, incomplete or insufficient links between artifacts.	1-2 Unacceptable
The testing of the features is attempted, but its coverage is not complete. The testing is not linked directly to the final version of the requirements, or the final version of the design document. The traceability matrix is incomplete or generally not correct.	<b>3-4</b> Unsatisfactory
<u>Threshold requirements:</u> The testing of the developed features is <i>complete</i> , and most of its tests are passed. For the most part, the testing of the features is directly related to the requirements, the architecture. and the feedback received from the TA during the sprints. The traceability document is present and complete.	<b>5</b> Acceptable
The requirements for an 'Acceptable' grade are met. In addition, the deliverable provides a complete testing suite of the development activities. Coding standards have been mostly adhered to, and documentation provided. A report of the testing activities by the members of the group is being provided, with evidence of the testing activity by each member.	<b>6-7</b> Good/Very Good
The requirements for a 'Good' or 'Very Good' grade are met. In addition this part of the report demonstrates a <i>complete</i> and <i>correct</i> suite of tests, from the verification and validation points of view. This must be demonstrated (a) during the live demo that will correctly link the tests to the implemented features, and (b) via a traceability matrix.	8-9-10 Excellent/ Exceptional