Student ID 1   :

Student ID 2   :

A. Follow-up (CLO1)

Assessment Area	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Marks
Identification of Problems Solutions (5)					
Analysis/Design Updates (5)					
Sub-total (/10 marks)					

B. Tests Document (CLO1, CLO2) (individual)

Assessment Area	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Marks	
					Student 1	Student 1
Screen Shots (2)						
Test objectives (Iteration 2) (5)						
• Test Plan (updated) (5) • Tests methods specification evaluation • Tools (if any)						
Tests results (8) (outline & layout of results using Automated Testing Tools) • Unit • Integration • System (func and nonfunc)						
Tests analysis report (5)						
Conclusion (5)						
Sub-total (/30 marks)						

C. Documentation, Presentation and Collaboration (CLO3, CLO4)

Assessment Area	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Marks	
Documentation (Design and Testing) (5) • Format Consistency/Spelling/Grammar • Professionalism						
					Student 1	Student 2
Project Management (5) • Updated Trello/Gantt Chart						
Collaboration via Git (10) -push/pull/merge/issue (evidence of collaboration)						
Presentation (10)						
Sub-total (/30 marks)						

D. System (CLO1)

Assessment Area	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Marks	
					Student 1	Student 2
Application operation success rate (15) • System functional/partially functional /not working • Adequacy of the levels of complexity of the design • Validations in place						
Quality of software produced: (15) • fulfilment of requirements/objectives • usability (UX and ease of use)						
Sub-total (/30 marks)						

		Student 1	Student 2
Total (A + B + C+D+E)			
No Turnitin Report	(-5 marks)	(-)	
No Marksheet	(-5 marks)	(-)	
Late Submission	5 marks per day (____ days)	(-)	
	TOTAL		

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Feedback

A. Follow up

Analysis / System design:

☐	Analysis	not clearly defined / not updated
☐	Design	not clearly defined / not updated
☐	Problems/Solutions	not found

B. Tests Document

☐	Screen Shots	not consistent with the design/not found
☐	Tests objectives	not clearly defined / insufficient / lacking in proper labelling
☐	Test methods, specs.	not clearly defined / insufficient / not found/No automated tools used
☐	Tests results	not clearly defined / insufficient / not found
☐	Tests analysis report	not clearly defined / insufficient / not found
☐	Conclusion	no reflection on objectives / not found

C. Documentation:

☐	Format	table of contents not found/inconsistent font size/no proper headings
☐	Spelling/Grammer	spelling mistakes/sentences are not comprehensible/sentences too long
☐	Turnitin	not found
☐	Gantt Chart	not updated
☐	Trello	not updated

Presentation and Collaboration:

☐	Use of GIT	no evidence of use/minimum use

D. System

☐	Prototype	did not meet functional req/did not meet non functional req/not working/ Unable to be deployed

RUBRIC FOR ORAL PRESENTATION - PROTOTYPE II

Category	Exemplary (5 Points)	Advanced (4 points)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2 points)	Not evident (1 point)	Marks Allocated	
Layout Does your website have An attractive and usable layout? Is it well organized?	• The website has an exceptionally attractive and usable layout. • It is easy to locate important elements.	• The website has an attractive and usable layout. • It is easy to locate important elements.	• The website a usable layout but boring. • It is easy to locate important elements.	• The website has a cluttered or confusing layout. • It is difficult to locate important elements.	• The website has an unusable layout. • It is difficult to locate important elements.		
Navigation Is your website easy to navigate forward and backwards with working links?	• Links are clearly labelled, consistently placed, and allow the reader to easily move from page to page	• Links are labelled, and allow the reader to easily move from page to page	• Links allow the reader to move from page to page but some links seems to be missing.	• Links are labelled but are broken	• Missing links		
Theme and Consistency and Creativity Does the prototype have a consistent font, colour and style theme?	• Website uses a consistent colour scheme throughout the website. • Pages are all related • Ideas are creative and innovative	• Website has a colour scheme. • Less than 3 fonts are used • Graphic elements enhance and support presentation of the content	• Website has a colour scheme but not all pages are the same. • Less than 3 fonts are used • Good use of graphics/design elements	• Website has randomly chosen elements throughout. • More than 3 fonts are used. • Minimal use of design elements, lots of text	• Website has no colour scheme • Pages are unrelated • More than 3 fonts are used. • Use of elements does not support the content of the website		
Functionality Does the prototype meet user requirements?	• All functionalities are in place and are working	• All functionalities in place but with minor errors	• Partial functionalities are working	• Only 1 functionality is working	• None of the functionalities are working		

Oral Presentation Communicate effectively with the audience and lecturer?	• Presenter was passionate about the topic, energetic, relaxed and confident with a clear delivery • Presentation was well-rehearsed • Voice, eye contact and pacing held the attention of the audience	• Delivery was clear • Communication of ideas was good • Voice projection was good • Good eye contact was made	• Relatively interesting, rehearsed with a fairly smooth delivery that holds audience attention • Voice projection was adequate with very few mispronounced words, or "um" and "likes"	• Communication of the idea was broken and hard to follow • Voice projection was low with very few mispronounced words, or "um" and "likes" • Eye contact was infrequent	• Presenter struggled in the presentation with poor voice projection, no eye contact with the audience and no introduction • Communication of the idea was broken and hard to follow	
					TOTAL (/25)	
					(/10)	