

Group #	18		
Number of students in team	5		
Project stream identified as	Software		Faethm - personalised onboarding screen / landing page for newly signed users
Deliverables certificate submitted?	Yes		
# students on deliverables certificate	5		Lowest is 7 hours and the highest is 20 hours... have the team contributions been discussed and agreed upon for each deliverable?
Total marks	11.70	HD	
Out of	13.00		
Section	Awarded Mark	Out Of	Comments
Project Plan			
Statement of Purpose/Scope/Description	0.30	0.50	Good detail Missing project scope?
Risk Management	0.65	0.75	For each identified risk, consider showing the "calculated" risk column based on the first table included. What are some other risks to the project / technology / people / requirements that could happen which might be a significant risk to the project success?
Resource Management	0.60	0.75	Who are the clients? They might be resources too as you'd need to ask them questions / spend time interacting with them. Software: what about editors, code management, document storage, communication platforms for the project...?
Team Organisation and Structure	0.40	0.50	consider including the Sponsor details as part of the team... remember Scrum teams have scrum master, dev team, and also the "product owner"... there are other equivalents in other Agile-based projects.
Project Schedule			
Tasks/Activities/Phases	0.50	0.50	
Timeline	0.45	0.50	timeline missing the inclusion of milestones / tasks dependencies
Resources Allocated	0.25	0.25	
Process model discussed/justified	0.05	0.15	Unclear what the process model is... is it a waterfall approach or an agile-based approach? How long between each sprint / review? Agile is a "meta" methodology... What specific approach will you use?

Documentation Identified/discussed	0.15	0.15	
Assumptions	0.20	0.25	please uniquely number these (e.g. A1, A2, A3)
Quality Manual			
Quality Control and Management	0.10	0.25	missing significant details about what quality controls the team will be using.
Reviews and Audits, Testing, Tools	0.60	0.75	Clear roles and responsibilities. Have a look at (r a c i) for how to define who is responsible, accountable... etc. For the testing section, who is responsible for running the tests and what resources would be needed? How much is reported back to the sponsor?
Tracking/Change Management and Tools	0.75	0.75	
Communication	0.50	0.50	
Conflict Resolution/Negotiation	0.20	0.25	What about conflicts with the client? What about considering the need for escalations to the COMP3850 staff?
Standards/Templates/Appendices/Forms	0.20	0.20	
Penalties or deductions	0.00	0.00	
Project Plan and Quality Manual Total	5.90	7.00	
Scoping / Requirements Document			
Purpose/Project Scope & Context Diagram	0.40	0.50	Data flow diagram is great, but unclear which part your team is responsible for vs what already exists. Also unclear what data is being passed from process to process (although this is addressed in the logic flow diagram, so isn't a problem). Some good coverage otherwise.
Definitions/References/Overview	0.20	0.25	It will help to keep the list in alphabetical order.
Document convention/intended audience	0.25	0.25	For 1.5.1, give a bit more signposting about which sections they can find certain parts in. This is mainly document scaffolding rather than a substantive item, so no marks deducted... but advice provided for how to better improve the section. Good clear intended audience.
Follows Format Specified/Well-presented	0.25	0.25	
Product Perspective/Features	0.25	0.25	
User Classes and Characteristics	0.45	0.50	What about people of various capabilities /

			experience levels? E.g. vision impaired, ...
Operating Environment	0.90	1.00	What about the front end client support (which browsers / screen sizes, ...)
User Documentation & Help	0.20	0.25	What form of "documentation" will be provided? Text, pdf, printout, code comments, ...? Be more specific here please. What can they expect to receive?
Functional Requirements (FR) "The system shall ..."	0.50	0.50	
FR Uniquely identified	0.20	0.25	each sub dot point should be numbered too (e.g. FR3 might have REQ1 and REQ2 rather than the two dot points). This means you can make a direct reference to a specific requirement... and also helps with tracking / cross referencing between documents
FR Organised/structured/grouped	0.25	0.25	grouped by feature
FR Covers functionality	0.50	0.50	appears to
FR Unambiguous/testable/consistent	0.25	0.50	Consider including Fit Criteria. Some can be determined, but the fit criteria will help to make it crystal clear how each requirement will be evaluated.
NonFR (security, performance, access, etc)	0.80	1.00	Some good work here, but needs to be measurable. Consider adding fit criteria so that it is clear how the Non-functional requirements will be evaluated. Also provide clearer measures / expectations in the requirement description.
Design/Implementation Req (platform,language, etc)	0.20	0.25	see above
Usability Requirements (ease of use, training, etc)	0.20	0.25	see above
Customer Feedback	0.00	0.00	included
Penalties or deductions	0.00	0.00	none applied.
Scoping Document Total	5.80	6.75	