**Appendix A: Marking Scheme**

**Student ID 1 : E1800193**

**Student ID 1 : E1800189**

**A. Design Document**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LO** | **Assessment Area** | **Poor** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **Marks** |
| **CLO1** | Introduction to Design Document [3] |  |  |  |  |  |
| Architectural Design [2+2+2]   * Site Map * Design Class Diagram * System Sequence Diagram + Contracts (updated) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data design(ERD)[3] Database/File Design[3] |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wire Frames[5] |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | **Sub-total (/20 marks)** | | |  |

1. **Tests Document – individual**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LO** | **Assessment Area** | **Poor** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **Marks** | |
| **CLO1** | Test objectives [3] |  |  |  |  | Student 1 | Student 1 |
| [2]   * Test Plan (includes) * Tests methods specification evaluation * Schedule |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Testing – Using Selenium   * Unit Testing [4] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Integration Testing [4] * System (func and nonfunc) [4] |  |  |  |  |  | |
| Tests analysis report [3] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | |  | **Sub-total (/20 marks)** | | |  |  |

1. **Documentation and Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LO** | **Assessment Area** | **Poor** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **Marks** | |
| **CLO3** | Documentation (Design and Testing) [5]   * Format Consistency * Spelling/Grammar * Professionalism |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **CLO2** | • Project Management[5] Gantt Chart – need to indicate progress – compare with baseline |  |  |  |  | Student 1 | Student 2 |
| **CLO3** | Presentation[10] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | |  | **Sub-total (/30 marks)** | |  |  |

1. **Peer Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Area** | |  | **Marks** | |
| **CLO3** | Peer Assessment |  | Student 1 | Student 2 |
|  | | **Sub-total (/10 marks)** |  |  |

1. **Collaboration & System Implementation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LO** | **Assessment Area** | **Poor** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **Marks** | |
| **CLO1** | Application operation success rate [10]   * System functional/partially functional/not working for iteration 1 [3] |  |  |  |  | Student 1 | Student 2 |
|  | * Adequacy of the levels of complexity of the design [4] * Validations in place [3] |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of software produced[10]   * fulfilment of requirements/ objectives * usability & navigation(UX and ease of use) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collaboration via Git [10]   * setup repository * push/pull/ branch/merge |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | **Sub-total (/30 marks)** | | | |  |  |

**Comments**

**Feedback**

1. **Design Document**

**Conceptual / System design:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Architectural Design insufficient / not clearly defined / irrelevant / not found |
|  | System Design insufficient / not clearly defined / irrelevant / not found |
|  | Wireframes poor / lack in commonality or metaphor / inconsistent / not found |

**Technical design:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Data /Module Design incomplete / lack in labelling / inconsistent notation / poor / not found |
|  | Others insufficient / not concise / contain irrelevant facts / not specified |

1. **Tests Document**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Tests objectives not clearly defined / insufficient / lacking in proper labelling/not found |
|  | Test methods, specs not clearly defined / insufficient / not found |
|  | Tests results not clearly defined / insufficient / not found/Did not use any tools |
|  | Tests analysis report not clearly defined / insufficient / not found |

1. **Documentation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Format table of contents not found/inconsistent font size/no proper headings |
|  | Spelling/Grammar spelling mistakes/sentences are not comprehensible/sentences too long |
|  | Gantt Chart not found/not comparison with baseline |

1. **Peer Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Did not evaluate/irrelevant answers/incomplete |

1. **Collaboration & System Implementation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Prototype did not meet functional req/did not meet non-functional req/not working/Poor design of screen layouts/poor interaction or navigation/difficult to use |
|  | Use of Git no evidence of use/minimum use |

**Oral Presentation Rubric for Prototype 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Not Evident-1** | **Developing-2** | **Proficient-3** | **Advanced-4** | **Exemplery-5** |
| **ORGANIZATION (5 POINTS)** | | | | | |
| Introduction included name of presenter(s), aim, and objectives in Iteration 1 or 2  Structure/Organization of slides  Concluded with Gantt chart/git hub and next iteration | * No introduction, no title of project, poorly structured slides * No updates on Gantt chart and Git hub | * Introduction to team members, project and aim stated * Poor structured slides * No clear updates on Gantt chart and Git hub | * Introduction to team members, project and aim stated * Well-structured slides * Unclear and poorly defined updates on Gantt chart and Git hub | * A good start on the introduction of members * Well-structured slides * Clear updates on Gantt chart but poorly defined use of Git hub | * A good start on the introduction of members * Well-structured slides * Clear and well defined updates on Gantt chart and Git hub showcasing the usage |
| **EFFECTIVENESS IN COVERING OBJECTIVES (30 POINTS)** | | | | | |
| Oral Presentation | * Presenter struggled in the presentation with poor voice projection * Communication of the main idea was broken and hard to follow. | * Communication of the idea was broken and hard to follow. * Voice projection was low with several mispronounced words, or "um's" and "likes", “lah” | * Relatively interesting, rehearsed with a fairly smooth delivery that usually holds audience attention. * Voice projection was adequate with very few mispronounced words, or "um's" and "likes", “lah”. | * Delivery was clear. * Communication of ideas was good. * Voice projection was good | * Presenter was passionate about the topic, energetic, relaxed, and confident, with a clear delivery. * Presentation was well-rehearsed |
| Navigation, Buttons, Clicks | * Links, Buttons and Clicks don’t work at all | * Links seem to missing and don’t allow the ready to easily navigate. * Some Buttons and Clicks not working properly | * Links allow the user to move from page to page, but some links seem to be missing * Some Buttons and Clicks not working properly | * Links are labelled and allow the user to easily move from page to page. * Buttons and Clicks are working properly | * Links, Buttons and Clicks are clearly labelled, consistently placed, and allow the user to easily move from page to page. |
| Website covers core product functions stated in Iteration 1 or 2 as per the use cases, SSD and contracts | * Not functioning as per the requirement | * Minimal functionalities are working as per the expanded use case, SSD and contracts | * Only half of the functionalities are working as per the expanded use case, SSD and contracts | * Most of the functionalities are working as per the expanded use case, SSD and contracts | * All Functionalities are working as per the expanded use case, SSD and contracts |
| UX design is consistent with principles of UX design | * Website has randomly chosen elements throughout. * More than three fonts are used within the website. | * Website has randomly chosen elements throughout. * More than three fonts are used within the website. | * Website uses a color scheme, but not all pages are the same. * Less than three fonts are used within the website. | * Website has a color scheme. * Less than three fonts are used. | * Website uses a consistent color scheme throughout the website. * Less than three fonts are used and they consistently highlight titles and have readable content. * Pages all seem related |
| Website has an attractive and usable layout | * Use of elements detracts from presentation. * Graphics, color schemes, transitions, and backgrounds disrupt flow. | * Little evidence of original thinking. * Minimal use of design elements. * Lots of text, little use of other elements such as graphics or pictures. | * Good use of graphics and/or other design elements. * Evidence of originality and creativity enhance the content presented | * Excellent sense of creativity and design. * Graphic elements enhance and support the presentation of content. | * Product shows a large amount of original thought. * Ideas are creative and innovative. |
| Validations in place | * No validations found | * Random and basic validations found | * Validations are placed in some data entry fields to avoid mistakes by user | * Validations are realistically placed thoroughly in the data entry forms | * Website data entry forms have been designed intuitively to validate data entry |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total (35) |
|  |  |  |  |  | /10 |

Comments: