| Group # | 18 | | |
|--|--------------|--------|---|
| Number of students in team | 5 | | |
| Project stream identified as | Software | | |
| Deliverables certificate submitted? | Yes | | |
| # students on deliverables certificate | 5 | | |
| Total marks | 10.20 | D | |
| Out of | 13.00 | | |
| | | | |
| Section | Awarded Mark | Out Of | Comments |
| Revised Project Plan | 0.3 | 0.5 | Doesn't really seem like you've actioned all the feedback from D2. Also, where is the conflict resolution section? You also haven't added anything about handover. How are you delivering the project to the client? |
| Revised Scoping/Requirements | 0.2 | 0.25 | Diagrams aren't bad. A few odd decisions - to include "Cost" and then say there are no Cost restraints is a bit odd, namely because there absolutely is a restraint in that you aren't working with a budget. |
| Not well-presented, spelling mistakes, language not businesslike | | | |
| Deliverables certificate not included? | | | |
| List of Assumptions | 0.15 | 0.25 | This is a very short list. What about the assumptions around what will be released? What are the expectations your client has for the product? What are some of the things you can assume about users of the product? I've bumped your mark up a little here because another list of assumptions appears later, but put yourself in the shoes of a client - are they going to go hunting through a document to find what they need? |
| Prototype/MVP/Project Output | 4.25 | 4.5 | Some evidence is here (such as the figma board), but feedback from the client is after the testing document. I've had to knock down your mark a bit for this, because it isn't following spec. Overall, this document doesn't follow the structure laid out very well. This might seem nitpicky, but it is a very important skill to master for your transition into industry. |
| Initial Section Subtotal | 4.9 | 5.5 | |

| Analysis and Design Documents | | | |
|--|-----|------|---|
| Use case diagram | 0.5 | 0.75 | Not bad, but very brief. There is more to it than just picking a persona. You demonstrate this yourself with your prototype! |
| Use Case descriptions and User Stories (Well-structured, sensible, complete) | 0.7 | 1 | Good, but user stories are often just re-stating other information. This is actually where the personas could come in handy for fleshing out the kinds of users approaching the site. |
| System Design Document | 0.9 | 1 | Nicely detailed, well done. |
| Design – includes UML models, structure charts, Report Layouts | 0.5 | 0.75 | Some more info here would be good. What about report layouts on user data? |
| User Interface Layouts, Screen Navigation | 0.5 | 0.5 | Very well illustrated! Well done. |
| Data Definitions/Schemas/ER | 0.2 | 0.5 | A lot more info needed here! This doesn't tell me much at all about the data you are collecting and what you are doing with it. |
| Penalties and Deductions | | 0 | |
| Analysis and Design Subtotal | 3.3 | 4.5 | |
| Test Specification | | | |
| Test Plan | 1 | 1.75 | Not bad, but you don't seem to be testing UI or UX at any point. Given what you are creating is essentially a survey, this kind of testing is very important. I'd also like to know a little bit more about what data you are collecting when you test. |
| Test-case specifications | 1 | 1.25 | Good to test functionality, but again, I think you should be turning your attention to testing UI and UX as well, especially given most of the feedback from the client is around this kind of thing. |
| Penalties and Deductions | | 0 | |
| Test Specification Subtotal | 2 | 3 | |