DESIGN Overall system design Detailed System design Detailed data dictionary. Design data dictionary Becord structure Design data dictionary Becord structure Jerich model Coddly drawn but concept can be seen. Storage material and format Algs for data transformation User interface Jerich model Je	ļ	
Title/Type of System: Repair management system for school IT Technicians Page Mahalysis Band Comments Page Missackground and problem ident 2 Some background details. 1 Description of current system 3 Adequate description of what is the current system that is actually used. See also form in appendix and very good interview. 1,2,A1 User Identification 3 Users clearly identified. 1 User needs and limitations 3. Clear description of user needs. 2 Data sources and destinations 2 Reasonable, but for new system not existing system. 4 Data volumes 2. Brief, but covers key points. 4 Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 Dought and proposed 3 Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. 4 Objectives 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 6 ER model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 Design Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 5 System security Not done. 19 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treate		
Analysis Background and problem ident 2 Some background details. 1 Description of current system 3 Adequate description of what is the current system that is actually used. See also form in appendix and very good interview. 1,2,A1 User Identification 3 Users clearly identified. 1 User needs and limitations 3 Clear description of user needs. 2 Data sources and destinations 2 Reasonable, but for new system not existing system. 4 Data volumes 2 Brief, but covers key points. 4 Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 DFDs existing and proposed 3 Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. A2 Objectives 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 6 Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Algo and data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Algo and data dictionary 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good descriptions of structure seem. 7 Algo for data transformation 3 Good descriptions of structure on the seem. 7 Algo for data transformation 3 Good descriptions of structure of the processing made with each record plan. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good descriptions on file processing made with each record plan. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good descriptions on file processing made with each record plan. 14 Algs for data transformation 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculat		
Background and problem ident 2 Some background details. 1 Description of current system 3 Adequate description of what is the current system that is actually used. See also form in appendix and very good interview. 1,2,A1 User identification 3 Users clearly identified. 1 User needs and limitations 3 Clear description of user needs. 2 Data sources and destinations 2 Reasonable, but for new system not existing system. 4 Data volumes 2 Brief, but covers key points. 4 Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 DFDs existing and proposed 3 Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. A2 DFDs existing and proposed 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed Solution 3 Reasonable justification. 6 Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Poesing data dictionary 3 Osod descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good recording files and the processing made with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. System security 10 User interface 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite		
Description of current system 3 Adequate description of what is the current system that is actually used. See also form in appendix and very good interview. 1 1 User ldentification 3 Users clearly identified. 1 1 User needs and limitations 3 Clear description of user needs. 2 Reasonable, but for new system not existing system. 4 Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 DFDs existing and proposed 3 Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. A2 DOBjectives 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 4 Bread and interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A3 Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good secriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Algs for data transformation 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 3 Clear justification with a sit of processing made with each record plan. 4 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good respectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.	ırk	Max
Service Serv		
User needs and limitations 3 Clear description of user needs. 2 Reasonable, but for new system not existing system. 4 Data volumes 2 Brief, but covers key points. 4 Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 DPDs existing and proposed 3 Good set of DPDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. A2 Objectives 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 10 Set of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2 Let R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good: 5 Possible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the abelievites set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discusse		
Data sources and destinations 2 Reasonable, but for new system not existing system. 4 Data volumes 2 Brief, but covers key points. 4 Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 Data volumes 3 Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. A2 Objectives 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 66 Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A3 Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
Data sources and destinations 2 Reasonable, but for new system not existing system. 4 Data volumes 2 Brief, but covers key points. 4 Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 DFDs existing and proposed 3 Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. A2 Objectives 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 66 Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A3 Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. 23 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 3 Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. A2 Objectives 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 6 Clear methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 9 Very good. System security Not done. 1 Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 7 Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 7 Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.		
Analysis data dictionary 2 Covers recording of faults but not assets in current system. 4 DFDs existing and proposed 3 Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. A2 Objectives 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 6 Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A3 Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Yalidation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. 7 Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
DFDs existing and proposed 3 Good set of DFDs for existing and proposed systems, in appendix. A2 Objectives 3 Clear and numbered. Could be extended. Confirms adequate scope. 5 Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 6 Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A3 Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Algs for data transformation 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good attionale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 6 Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good ards a Very good. 23 System security Not done. 23 System security Not done. 23 Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
Potential solutions 2 Brief comparison with two commercial systems. 6 Proposed solution 3 Reasonable justification. 6 Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good ards a Very good. 23 System security Not done. 23 System security Not done. 23 Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
Proposed solution Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. System security Not done. Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24	\dashv	
Use of formal methods 3 An excellent interview on page 2 and sample form in appendix. 2,A1 E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. 7 Sive user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
E-R model 2 Satisfactory, but does not include assets. 5 DESIGN Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A3 Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24	-	
DESIGN Overall system design in places. Overall system design in places. Overall system design in places. Overall system system design in places. Overall system design in places. Overall system design in places. Overall system system design in places. Overall system design in places. Overall system system design in places. Overall system system design in places. Overall system design in places. Overall system design in places. Overall system system design in places. Overall system system design in places. Overall system design. Overall system desi	7	12
Overall system design 2 This is only covered by the DFDs in the appendix. A3 Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. 23 Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
Modular structure 2 Diagram satisfactory but a bit confusing in places. A7 Design data dictionary 3 Detailed data dictionary. 7 Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
Design data dictionary Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24	-	
Record structure 3 Good descriptions of structures of 4 appropriate files. 15 Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24 Interpretation of the project was started.		
Validation 3 Good suggestions, a range of different checks. 14 File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. 14 E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 7 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. 23 Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
File organisation and processing 3 Good comments on file processing made with each record plan. E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 5 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 5 System security Not done. Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
E-R model 2 Oddly drawn but concept can be seen. 5 Storage material and format 3 Clear justification, with file sizes calculated. 17 Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24 Storage material and format in the procedure of the project was started.		
Storage material and format Algs for data transformation 3	-	
Algs for data transformation 3 Plans of two algorithms, one for linear search, one for counting open jobs? Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.	-	
Would benefit from a written explanation before pseudo-code. Still fairly good. 19 User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
User interface 3 Good rationale. Several screens planned with satisfactory explanations. 8 Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. 23 System security Not done. 23 Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started. 24		
Security and integrity of data 3 Very good. System security Not done. Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.	\neg	
System security Test strategy 2 A limited test strategy. 23 TECHNICAL SOLUTION Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.	\dashv	
Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.	\dashv	
Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.	7	12
Technical competence 3 Five user-defined data types. Sensible decomposition into procedures. Five files of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.		12
of records, all treated sequentially. Very limited use of parameter passing, hence too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.		
too many globals. Quite a lot of very similar code e.g. several search procedures. Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.		
Achieves the objectives set in the analysis but these are somewhat cut down from what we discussed before the project was started.		
from what we discussed before the project was started.		
	12	20
	_	20
Design of test plan 4 43 tests planned, covering entire scope of system. 68	-	
Minimal test data 4 Clear test data given with almost every test. 68		
Typical data 4 Lots of examples. 68		
Erroneous data 4 Several examples. 68	-	
Extreme data No examples.	\neg	
Annotated test results 4 Evidence of good range of tests being carried out. Some could do with a bit more	-	
	6	8
SYSTEM MAINTENANCE		
System overview 2 Brief written overview. Some additional material in appendix. 56,A3		
Algorithms 3 Good descriptions of two algorithms. 56		$oxedsymbol{oxed}$
Annotated listings 3 Clearly set out code. Sensible variable and procedure names. Level of		
commenting fine.		1
Procedure and variable lists 3 Very clear and detailed lists and descriptions of algorithms and variables. 61	5	7

USER MANUAL					
Contents page		No separate contents page.			
Introduction and installation	3	Very detailed instructions.	100		
Screen displays explained	3	Good explanations of all screenshots.	104		
Error handling	3	Good section on error handling.	111		
Appropriate level for user	2	Satisfactory instructions for many but not all aspects of system.	104		
Enables easy use of system	2	Satisfactory instructions for many but not all aspects of system.	104	4	7
APPRAISAL					
Objectives evaluated		Good comparison to objectives with decent level of discussion.	114		
Further development?		Sensible ideas for extension. Could be more.	116		
User feedback and analysis		Some feedback, but not entirely convinced by this. The feedback is analysed.	117	3	6
QWC			-		
		All objectives met.		3	3
TOTAL				47	75