**Subtask 3: Implementing and Evaluation Mark Sheet**

**Names:**

**Accuracy of basic implementation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect Covered |  | Pass | Good / Excellent | Comments | Max | Score |
| System structure as per static model | Implementation is not related to the design  0-1 | Implementation is related to the design, but includes some major changes that are not mentioned in the critical reflection report  2 - 3 | The components required to implement the base functionality have been implemented following the designs  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
| Functionality from dynamic model | Core functionality is not present  0-1 | Basic functionality is implemented, but the implementation is incorrect or incomplete  2-3 | The basic functionality defined in the model has been implemented successfully and any changes are discussed (in critical reflection report)  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
| User Interfaces from designs | Implementation does not follow the designs  0-1 | Clear relation between implemented system and original designs, but with significant differences  2-3 | The high fidelity UI designs have been implemented and any changes are discussed (in the critical reflection report)  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
|  | | | | | **Max 15** |  |

**Quality of Engineering & Formal Testing**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect Covered |  | |  | | Pass | | Good / Excellent | Comments | Max | Score |
| Documentation and commenting | No documentation or useful comments  0 | | Some reasonable comments in code  1 | | Useful comments in code and sensible documentation provided  2 - 3 | | Detailed documentation for the system and key algorithms are explained  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
| Use of version control | No version control  0 | | Some evidence of version control using a suitable tool  1 | | Evidence of systematic version control using appropriate tools  2 -3 | | Evidence of professional use of version control and integration with test, build and management tools  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
| Test process | No testing  0 | | Some basic unit testing  1 | | Reasonable suite of tests with some relationship to test cases identified in requirements  2 - 3 | | Detailed test suite that completely covers test cases identified in requirements and includes key aspects of the system  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
| Additional evidence of good practice | No additional evidence of good practice  0 | | Basic use of simple tools and methods  1 | | Good overall practice making use of suitable tools and methods  2 - 3 | | Excellent practice using an integrated suite of tools and methods to cover all parts of the development process  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
|  | |  | |  | |  | | | **Max 20** |  |

**UI Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect Covered |  | Pass | Good / Excellent | Comments | Max | Score |
| Approach to evaluation | Little or no evidence that approach has been considered. Methods are ad hoc and lack justification  0 - 1 | A clearly-defined approach has been selected and justification is given  2 - 3 | A sensible approach and methods have been selected and a good justification is given for the choice  4 -5 |  | 5 |  |
| Plan for evaluation | Little or no plan provided  0 – 1 | A good plan is presented, but with some weaknesses  2 - 3 | A clear plan for evaluation described, addressing practical issues and usable by an independent assessor  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
| Ethical considerations | Little or no evidence that ethical issues have been considered  0-1 | Discussion of ethical issues and appropriate actions taken  2 -3 | Clear evidence that ethical issues have been identified and managed showing detailed independent reflection  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
| Report on evaluation conducted | Little or no evidence of systematic data collection and analysis  0 -1 | Evaluation data presented in a useful way and useful analysis conducted  2 – 3 | Evaluation data presented clearly, detailed analysis and clear presentation of results  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
| Re-design suggestions | Little or no suggestions for re-design  0 -1 | Some sensible redesign suggestions, based on evaluation results  2 – 3 | Well-reasoned redesign recommendations with clear links to evaluation findings  4 - 5 |  | 5 |  |
|  | | | | | **Max 25** |  |

**Critical Reflection Report (10 marks)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect Covered |  | Pass | Good / Excellent | Comments | Max | Score |
| Changes to underlying software structure | Little or no detail given of changes made.  0 - 1 | Some specific changes identified with basic justification for choices  2 | Detailed account of major changes, with clear justifications for all the major decisions  3 |  | 3 |  |
| Changes to user interaction | Little or no detail given of changes made.  0 - 1 | Some specific changes explained with basic justification for choices  2 - 3 | Detailed account of major changes, with clear (empirical or analytic) justifications for all the major decisions  4 |  | 4 |  |
| Reflections on software project management | Little or no reflection on project management issues.  0 - 1 | Some useful reflections provided  2 | Clear evidence of collective reflection and learning  3 |  | 3 |  |
|  | | | | | **Max 10** |  |

**Totals**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Implementation | 15 |  |
| Quality of Engineering and Testing | 20 |  |
| UI Evaluation | 25 |  |
| Critical reflection | 10 |  |
| **Group Total** | **70** |  |

**Individual Enhancement**

**Name:**

Mark scheme:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect Covered | Low | Medium | High | Comments | Max | Score |
| Demonstration of advanced functionality or system improvement | Some basic enhancements demonstrated showing an individual contribution  0 - 5 | A substantial contribution that substantively enhances the quality of the system  6 – 11 | An exceptional enhancement that is highly relevant to the system and/or demonstrates strong software development skills  12 - 15 |  | 15 |  |
| Documentation | No documentation or little useful documentation  0 - 2 | Good quality documentation  3 - 5 | Thorough documentation using appropriate tools / formats  6 – 7 |  | 7 |  |
| Testing | Little or no evidence of testing  0 – 2 | Evidence of a single form of testing  3 - 5 | Evidence of substantial testing, combining multiple types of testing (e.g. two or more of unit, acceptance, integration, and/or usability testing)  6 - 8 |  | 8 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total for Individual Contribution | 30 |  |

Total mark for Individual: