

Report #1 Grading Sheet

Note: the grading is based on quality, readability, and completeness of the report as follows:

Group Number:			
Total Points:			
Aspect	Points total	Assigned points	Comment & memo
Cover Page	✓		
Individual Contributions Breakdown	✓		
2. Customer Statement of Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good, but some clarifications needed (5..6) • Fair, inadequate problem definition (3..4) • Poor, unclear statement of project (0..2) • excellent writing (+ 1..3 in extra effort) 	6		
3. Glossary of Terms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • missing terms, unclear definition (0..3) 	4		
4. Functional Requirements Specification			
a. Stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inconsistency (names, interactions, etc.), incompleteness, evident contradictions (0..1) 	2		
b. Actors and Goals Actors (2): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • small mistakes, incompleteness (0..1) Types (1) Goals (3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions unclear (2..3) • Severe incompleteness (0..1) • excellent, + 1 in extra effort 	6 (2 + 1 + 3)		
c. Use Cases Casual description (5): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minor errors (4..5) • serious incompleteness and unclear text (0..3) Full description (11): main scenario (7), alternative scenario (2), others (2). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minor errors, slightly inconsistent and insufficient (-1..2) • missing important cases (-3..6) 	16 (5 + 11)		
d. Use Case Diagram <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • small UML notation problems; some inconsistencies between the diagram and the use case descriptions (3..4) 	4		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> bad/flat design (0..2) 			
e. System Sequence Diagrams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good, small mistakes (notation, interactions, etc.) (7..9) Fair, some inconsistency with the scenario in use case description, unclear procedure (4..7) Poor, severe mistakes, missing important scenarios (0..3) excellent (+ 1..2 in extra effort) 	9		
5. Nonfunctional Requirements (FURPS+) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good, minor clarification needed (5..6) Fair, some mistakes and lack of knowledge (3..4) Poor, serious incompleteness and errors (0..2) 	6		
6. Domain Analysis			
a. Domain Model Concepts (12) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good, some notation incorrect, mostly makes sense (9..12) Fair, some bad choices of domain concepts (6..8) Poor, lack of understanding of domain model (0..5) Associations (4) Attributes (3)	19 (12 + 4 + 3)		
b. System Operation Contracts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good understanding of pre/post-conditions (5..6) errors, missing important status updates (0..4) excellent (number, quality, etc., + 1..3 in extra effort) 	6		
c. Mathematical Model Only if applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> missing, but apparently should be present (-3) excellent (+ 1..2 in extra effort) 	✓		
7. User Interface Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good: some mockup interfaces unexplained (6..8) Fair: moderate number of mockup interfaces missing; unclear description; poor effort estimation (3..5) Poor: description & user effort estimation mostly missing (0..2) 	8		
8. Plan of Work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> timeline (2) breakdown of responsibilities (1) 	3		
9. References	1		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • easy to understand (1) • only URL without a title shown, etc. (-1) 			
Extra Effort Report binding: + 1 Diagram clarity: + 1..3 Readability: + 1..4 Consistence: + 1..3 Completeness (self-contained): + 1..3 Perceived novelty: + 1..4 Missing page labeling (pagination) (-1)	10		
Other comments:			