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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceeds Requirements | Meets Requirements | Below Requirements |
|  |  | | |
| **Introduction** | * Clearly identifies purpose of document * Clearly identifies a potential user * Clearly justifies choice of user * Effectively uses a Situation/ Problem/Solution structure | * **Identifies purpose of document** * **Identifies a potential user** * **Justifies choice of user** * **Reasonable use of a Situation/ Problem/Solution structure** | * Unclear identification of purpose of document * Unclear identification of user * Inadequately justifies choice of user * Ineffective use of a Situation/ **Problem/Solution** structure |
| **System** **Architecture** | * UML Component Diagram effectively identifies high-level components of the system * UML Sequence Diagram effectively identifies the sequence of all interactions in the system * Diagrams are concisely and clearly explained | * U**ML Component Diagram identifies high-level components of the system** * **UML Sequence Diagram identifies the sequence of the main interactions in the system** * Diagrams are reasonably well explained | * UML Component Diagram is incomplete or incorrect * UML Sequence Diagram is incomplete or incorrect * **Diagrams are poorly explained** |
| **System Requirements** | * Functional requirements are carefully and clearly identified * Objectives are highly specific and relevant to both the user and the programmer * Specific goals have been assigned to objectives where appropriate * Constraints are valid, verifiable and comprehensive | * **Functional requirements are identified** * **Objectives are reasonably specific** * Goals have been assigned to objectives where appropriate * **Constraints are valid and verifiable but may be incomplete** | * **Functions are missing or misidentified** * **Objectives are missing or incorrect** * **No goals have been assigned to objectives** * Constraints are missing or are not verifiable |
| **Design** **Decisions** | * Clearly identifies major design decisions * Convincingly explains importance of decisions to the project * Effectively compares decisions to alternatives | * Identifies major design decisions * Satisfactorily explains importance of decisions to the project * Satisfactorily compares decisions to alternatives | * **Fails to identify major design decisions** * **Poor understanding of relevance of decisions to the project** * **Unconvincing comparison of decisions to alternatives** |
| **Conclusion** | * Sums up the document’s purpose and key information in a highly concise and precise manner | * **Sums up the document’s purpose and its key information** | * Unclear statement, disconnected to document’s purpose and key information |
| **Research** | * Carefully researched * All citations are included and follow IEEE format | * Satisfactory research * **Citations are included and most always follow IEEE format** | * **Insufficient research** * Citations are missing or do not follow IEEE format |
| **Performance Evaluation** | * Analysis is very clear and insightful * Graphs or tables are properly labeled and effectively integrated into report | * Analysis is clear and reasonably insightful * Graphs or tables are labeled and adequately integrated into report | * Analysis is unclear or incomplete * Graphs or tables are unlabeled and poorly integrated into report |
| **Language** | * Highly appropriate for intended audience * Language is highly precise and accurate * Excellent concision and clarity * Excellent use of both paragraphs and lists * Free of error | * **Appropriate for intended audience** * **Language is reasonably precise** * **Reasonable concision and clarity** * **Reasonable use of both paragraphs and lists** * **Mainly free of error** | * Inappropriate for intended audience * Language lacks precision * Writing is wordy and/or confusing * Poor use of paragraphs and lists * High level of error |
| **Format** | * Carefully formatted with clear organization of information * Highly effective use of both figures and tables * Tables and figures are very clearly labeled | * **Adequate organization of information** * **Effective use of figures and tables** * **Tables and figures are clearly labeled** | * Poor organization of information * Ineffective use of figures and tables * Tables and figures are unclearly labeled or lack labels |

Mark: 64

Further comments: Your user and gap are good, and you have good first hand research. Your technical descriptions are mostly concise and useful. You need more depth in certain areas, especially the technical requirements needed to support user needs (the link between these should come into play in the DDs, which are very thin). DDs is where you lost the most marks.

Performance Evaluation: Good job here. Methodology and purpose is clear, and while the visuals should have captions (an opportunity to add detail) the conclusion does a nice job of summing up concisely. The conclusion could be more specific, and refer to the figures. 4/5.