

Group/Project Name		
Final Mark		
<b>SECTION A: Requirements Document 3.0</b>	<b>Marks Possible</b>	<b>Mark</b>
<b>Structure</b>		
Relevant elements listed as in the provided template	1	
<b>Overview Included</b>		
Overview is correct and up to date.	1	
<b>Version control included</b>		
Version numbering is correct and up to date.	1	
<b>Sections contain relevant information</b>		
Information provided in the appropriate sections. (Deviations from the template are allowed so long as the document is logically organized).	1	
<b>Sections contain correct information</b>		
Feedback from RD2 (excluding AI reflection) has been addressed	4	
ERD is correct and represents the whole system	8	
Data dictionary is correct, fields are filled in logically, and the dictionary matches the ERD provided	4	
Prototype screens are provided for each major feature and are logical in relation to the description of the feature and associated requirements.	10	
Non-functional requirements are provided, written correctly, and are logical in relation to the descriptions of features and functional requirements of the system. It must be explicit what type of NFRs are written (e.g. Security, Interoperability)	10	
Context level DFD is provided and correct	2	
At least one DFD level 1 is provided and correct	3	
Dialog maps for two major features are provided and correct	6	
One swimlane diagram is provided and correct	3	
<b>Consistency of content</b>		
The document contains no contradictions (unless explicitly justified) between itself, and the original RFP.	3	
The document contains no contradictions within itself (i.e. no contradictions between the models, listed requirements, textual components)	3	
<b>SECTION A: Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>SECTION B: Reflection on the use of AI</b>	<b>Marks Possible</b>	<b>Mark</b>
Prompting and output history (chat logs) are provided	2	
<b>Transparency and specificity</b> - the reflection includes 3-5 specific descriptions of how AI was used. (Example: "We used ChatGPT" is vague compared to "We used chat GPT to iteratively generate user stories, we provided XYZ as context to the AI model which resulted in..."	10	
<b>Depth of reflection</b> - the reflection critically engages on the role of AI in the RE activities described above. <b>Relevant course concepts are discussed</b> , and the reflection <i>evaluates</i> the effectiveness of AI in terms of metrics that are logical, such as but not limited to accuracy of the output, quality of the output, quality of requirements written, etc.	10	
<b>Ethical Awareness and Responsible Use</b> - The reflection acknowledges key dangers of working alongside AI, such as overreliance, etc.	5	
<b>Quality of Writing</b> - clear, logical, free of spelling and grammatical errors	3	
In the case that students do not want to use AI, the reflection covers why the AI activities in this deliverable are done better <i>without</i> the use of AI. A critical evaluation of the use of AI in RE activities is thus still required.		
<b>SECTION B: Total</b>	<b>30</b>	
<b>Bonus marks for including one additional diagram that was not already required. Diagram is correct and logical in relation to the features and requirements written, and does not contradict other models or textual components.</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>COMBINED TOTAL</b>	<b>90</b>	