**Secure Software Development (Computer Science)**

**Assignment 1: Development Team Project: Design Document**

**Group 4**

**N.B.: Please note that all grades are provisional and subject to change until they have undergone internal and external moderation, approved by the External Examiner, and ratified by the Examination Board.**

**Knowledge & Understanding of the Topic/Issues (25%):**The students have demonstrated an excellent knowledge and understanding of the topic/issue with a special focus on the requirement of having a secured School Learning Management System for Schools (Se-LMS) with adequate rationale. The students have demonstrated an excellent level of awareness of the security-related challenges of the domain including the awareness of the application features that can be used to enable a secure solution. There are pieces of evidence of using various UMLs with detailed activities, which are absolutely brilliant. All the UMLs demonstrated clear understanding and logic, which have added extra values.

**Presentation and Communication Skills (Depth of solution design communicated) (30%):**To me, overall the students have demonstrated and excellent presentation and communication skills throughout. No noticeable issues have been noted throughout.

**Criticality (Awareness of the competing decisions that may support the system design) (25%):**It can be said that the solution proposal and methodology provide an excellent level of awareness of the competing decisions that may support the system design including tools and technologies, Threat modeling (including STRIDE and DREAD). The legal requirements and GDPR have been presented well in an appropriate critical way but could have been critical and more in-depth way.

**Structure and Presentation (Document design, document contents) (10%):**To me, there are no significant issues related to the document design and document contents. In regard to the communications, the student students have maintained the consistency on using future tense throughout. However, the students could have paid more careful attention on justifying texts of the assignments. Besides, the students could have paid more attention to the format of the in-text citation. For example, the source Spraul (2015) has been used wrongly (Spraul 2015), which should be (Spraul, 2015).

**Use of relevant sources (10%):**It can be said that the students have used a handful amount of academic sources, which are mostly up to date. As a suggestion, it would be great to see no more than five years of sources have been considered in the future **(for example, the source of Patel, Gadhavi & Patel (2013), Spraul (2015) used)**. Besides, it is recommended that the students use more appropriate academic sources like journals, articles, etc, instead of online sources.

**Grade: 78**