Student ID 1   : E1700882

Student ID 2   : E1700873

A. Design Document (CLO1)

Assessment Area	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Marks
Introduction (3)					
• Architectural Design (site map) (6) • Design Class Diagram • System Sequence Diagram (updated)					
Data design(ERD) (3+3) Database/File Design					
Wire Frames (5)					
Sub-total (/20 marks)					

B. Tests Document (CLO2) - individual

Assessment Area	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Marks	
					Student 1	Student 1
Test objectives (Iteration 1) (2)						
• Test Plan (3) • Tests methods specification evaluation • Description of Testing tools (if any)						
Tests results (10) (outline & layout of results using Automated Testing Tools) • Unit • Integration • System (func and nonfunc)						
Tests analysis report (5)						
Sub-total (/20 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) -setup repository -push/pull/merge						
Presentation (10)						
Sub-total (/30 marks)						

D. Peer Presentation Assessment (CLO4) (online submission – Excel worksheet)

Assessment Area		Marks	
		Student 1	Student 2
Peer Assessment (5)			
Sub-total (/5 marks)			

E. System (CLO1)

Assessment Area	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Marks	
					Student 1	Student 2
Application operation success rate (15) • System functional/partially functional /not working for iteration 1 • Adequacy of the levels of complexity of the design • Validations in place						
Quality of software produced: (10) • fulfilment of requirements/objectives • usability (UX and ease of use)						
Sub-total (/25 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. Design Document

Conceptual / System design:

☐	Architectural Design	insufficient / not clearly defined / irrelevant / not found
☐	System Design	insufficient / not clearly defined / irrelevant / not found
☐	Wireframes	poor / lack in commonality or metaphor / inconsistent / not found

Technical design:

☐	Data design	incomplete / lack in labelling / inconsistent notation / poor / not found
☐	Modules design	incomplete / lack in labelling / inconsistent notation / poor / not found
☐	Others	insufficient / not concise / contain irrelevant facts / not specified

B. Tests Document

☐	Tests objectives	not clearly defined / insufficient / lacking in proper labelling/not found
☐	Test methods, specs.	not clearly defined / insufficient / not found
☐	Tests results	not clearly defined / insufficient / not found/Did not use any tools
☐	Tests analysis report	not clearly defined / insufficient / 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 found/not updated
☐	Trello	no updates/minimal updates

Presentation and Collaboration:

☐	Use of GIT	no evidence of use/minimum use

D. Peer Evaluation

☐		Did not evaluate/irrelevant answers/incomplete/late submission

E. System

☐	Prototype	did not meet functional req/did not meet non functional req/not working/
		Poor design of screen layouts/poor interaction or navigation/difficult to use

Oral Presentation Rubric for Prototype 1 Peer Evaluation Done by Student ID: ……………………. (refer to Excel worksheet for online submission at https://lms.help.edu.my/helpelearning/course/

ORGANISATION (20 POINTS)						Student 1	Student 2
Introduction included name of presenter(s)	1	2	3	4	5		
Introduction included purpose and brief overview	1	2	3	4	5		
Concluded with definite ending and summarized main points	1	2	3	4	5		
Presentation well prepared and well organized	1	2	3	4	5		
CONTENT (20 points)							
Essence of presentation clearly conveyed and understood	1	2	3	4	5		
Enough, but not too much, material/detail given	1	2	3	4	5		
Explanations appropriate and understandable	1	2	3	4	5		
Knowledge and understanding of subject matter demonstrated	1	2	3	4	5		
DELIVERY (20 points)							
Presentation appeared extemporaneous (spoken, not read or memorized)	1	2	3	4	5		
Avoided vocal fillers ("You know", "Aahh", etc.)	1	2	3	4	5		
Made good use of visual aids to support and enhance presentation	1	2	3	4	5		

Visual aids easy to see, easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5		
EFFECTIVENESS IN COVERING OBJECTIVES (40 points)							
Presentation gave a clear understanding of what the product would do when using the website	1	2	3	4	5		
Navigation is clear and simple	1	2	3	4	5		
All buttons, clicks appeared to work	1	2	3	4	5		
Website covers core product functions stated in Iteration 1	1	2	3	4	5		
UX design is consistent with principles of good HCI	1	2	3	4	5		
Website has an attractive and usable layout	1	2	3	4	5		
Validations in place	1	2	3	4	5		
Functionality i.e. meeting the requirements of the use cases	1	2	3	4	5		
					Total (100)		
					/10		

Comments: INDICATE AT LEAST ONE STRENGTH & ONE COMPONENT TO IMPROVE

Strength	Area to improve