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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceeds Requirements | Meets Requirements | Below Requirements |
|  |  | | |
| **M2 Design Document Revisions and Editing** | 1. **Revisions are careful and detailed** 2. **Revisions demonstrate a superior understanding of genre and audience** 3. **Edits are correct** 4. **Writing is clear, highly economical,** and free of error | 1. Revisions are reasonably careful 2. Revisions demonstrate an understanding of genre and audience 3. Edits are generally correct 4. Writing is mainly clear and free of error | 1. Little or no attempt to make meaningful revisions 2. Revisions show little attention to genre and audience 3. Edits are incomplete or incorrect 4. High level of error in writing |
| **Executive Summary** | 1. **Clearly a stand-alone document** 2. Clearly identifies the project’s unique benefits 3. Highly appropriate for intended executive audience 4. Feasibility of project is convincingly stated 5. Paragraphs have clear topics and excellent cohesion 6. Writing is correct and economical | 1. Overall, a stand-alone document 2. **Identifies the project’s main benefits** 3. **Mainly appropriate for the intended audience** 4. **Project appears feasible** 5. **Paragraphs have reasonably clear topics and reasonable cohesion** 6. **Writing is mostly correct and economical** | 1. Has few or no stand-alone qualities 2. Little or no attempt to explain the benefits of the project 3. Summary is inappropriate for the intended audience. 4. No reason to believe the design concepts are valid or feasible 5. Paragraphs lack topics and cohesion 6. High level of writing error |
| **Use Case Scenario and Diagram** | 1. **Written use case provides reader with clear understanding of all required information** 2. **Structure of writing is highly visible with excellent use of headings and subheadings** 3. **Paragraph types are appropriate and varied** 4. **Writing is clear, highly economical, and free of error** 5. **Use case diagram is very well designed and very well integrated into report** 6. **Use case diagram contains highly appropriate level of detail** | 1. **Written use case is mainly clear and covers required points** 2. Structure of writing is visible with good use of headings and subheadings 3. Paragraph types are generally appropriate 4. Writing is mainly clear and free of error 5. Use case diagram is well designed and well integrated into report 6. Use case diagram contains acceptable level of detail | 1. Written use case is incomplete and/or confusing 2. Little or no explicit structure in writing 3. Paragraph types are often inappropriate 4. High level of error in writing 5. Use case diagram is either poorly designed or poorly integrated into report 6. Use case diagram has insufficient level of detail |
| **New Design** **Decisions** | 1. Effectively identifies all important Milestone 3 design decisions 2. Convincingly explains importance of decisions to the project 3. **Effectively argues for the decisions** 4. Effectively compares decisions to alternatives 5. Writing is clear, highly economical, and free of error | 1. Identifies all important Milestone 3 design decisions 2. **Satisfactorily explains importance of decisions to the project** 3. **Satisfactorily argues for the decisions** 4. **Satisfactorily compares decisions to alternatives** 5. **Writing is mainly clear and free of error** | 1. **Fails to identify all Milestone 3 design decisions** 2. Poor understanding of relevance of decisions to the project 3. Ineffective argument for the decisions 4. Unconvincing comparison of decisions to alternatives 5. High level of error in writing |
| **Conclusion** | 1. **Concise and informative summing up of the report** | 1. Reasonable conclusion but might include unnecessary information | 1. Fails to provide a concluding statement or statement is irrelevant |
| **References** | 1. **Carefully researched** 2. **Excellent choice of discipline-specific sources** 3. **All citations are included and always follow IEEE format** | 1. Satisfactory research 2. Sources are acceptable 3. All citations are included and closely follow IEEE format | 1. Insufficient research 2. Sources are not credible in the discipline 3. Citations are missing or do not follow IEEE format |
| **Appendices** | 1. **Material in appendices is highly appropriate** 2. **Appendices are very well organized** 3. **Graphical material is concisely explained and, where necessary, properly referenced** 4. **All material in appendices is effectively referred to in body of the report** | 1. Material in appendices is generally appropriate 2. Appendices are well organized 3. Graphical material is reasonably well explained and, where necessary, referenced 4. All material in appendices is referred to in body of the report | 1. Inappropriate material in appendices; either should be in body of report or is irrelevant 2. Appendices are poorly organized 3. Graphical material is poorly explained and/or lacks reference citations 4. Some appended material is not referred to in body of the report |
| **Bug Report** | 1. **Report has a highly visible structure** 2. **Report has high level of consistency** 3. **Descriptions are concise and clear** 4. **Interpretations are highly logical** 5. **Descriptions and interpretations are clearly separated** | 1. Report structure is reasonably clear 2. Information is conveyed in a consistent manner 3. Descriptions are mainly concise 4. Interpretations are logical 5. Descriptions and interpretations are generally separated | 1. Report is poorly structured 2. Information is conveyed inconsistently 3. Descriptions lack concision and precision 4. Interpretations are illogical 5. Descriptions and interpretations are unclear and poorly separated |

Mark: 91

Comments:

Good work. User is very well described, in both intro and use case. The ES could be shifted in it’s focus to be more business case directed. Still some tightening that can happen in the writing, and some unnecessary meta-discourse gets in the way of more meaningful content. Include more images for M4, and use the ones you have (hash table) more effectively.

Aside from missing the unpredictable results of the query function consideration, your DDs are mostly very good. You can add visuals and be more descriptive of the final system in M4, but very good for M3.

**Bug Report**  is excellent. No-nonesense, very clear, well organized, and bugs seem very much worth noting.