Student ID 1 :

Student ID 2 :

# 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** | |
| Test objectives (Iteration 1) (2) |  |  |  |  | Student 1 | Student 1 |
| * 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 |  |  |  |  |  | |
| Project Management (5)   Updated Trello/Gantt Chart |  |  |  |  | Student 1 | Student 2 |
| 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** | |
| Peer Assessment | (5) | Student 1 | Student 2 |
|  | **Sub-total (/5 marks)** |  |  |

# E. System (CLO1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Area** | **Poor** | **Satisfactory** | **Good** | **Excellent** | **Marks** | |
| 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 |  |  |  |  | Student 1 | Student 2 |
| 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

1. **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

1. **Peer Evaluation**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Did not evaluate/irrelevant answers/incomplete/late submission

1. **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

BIT302 Assignment 2 - Assessment

**Reviewing:**

Student 1 Name: I Putu Putra Narayana

Student 1 ID: E1700871

Student 2 Name: I Gusti Ngurah Yoghi Okaputra

Student 2 ID: E1700851

# Reviewer:

Name: Luh Wulandari Maharani

Student ID: E1700873

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

BIT302 Assignment 2 – Assessment4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Visual aids easy to see, easy to understand | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| **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 | 4 | 4 |
| Navigation is clear and simple | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| All buttons, clicks appeared to work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Website covers core product functions stated in Iteration 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| UX design is consistent with principles of good HCI | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Website has an attractive and usable layout | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Validations in place | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Functionality i.e. meeting the requirements of the use cases | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total (100) | 80 | 80 |
| /10 | 8 | 8 |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strength | Area to improve |
| Good explanation that she know what they making | Little bit nervous |