SRS Marking Scheme
Team Number:

1. Student Name: Darren Kitamura	**Student Number**: 0854359
2. Student Name: Andrew Azores	**Student Number**: 1048083
3. Student Name: Jazz Kersell	**Student Number**: 1041571
4. Student Name: Evan Holtrop	**Student Number**: 1059591

Spelling and Grammar – one mark off for every mistake, after the first two mistakes, to the maximum shown.

Comments:
- "products being developed doesn't have an official name"
- "They boast of an automatically-derived database of data about 30 million songs"

Total (8 %)	8/8

Style

Paragraph structure (logical grouping of ideas)
Concisely expressed ideas (not wordy)
Flow between paragraphs and sections
Adequate number of figures and other visuals (could be zero, if this is adequate)
"Pointers" in the document to help navigate through
Subsections logically organized (information hiding and encapsulation as much as possible)
Comments: - Hard to navigate, everything blends together

Total (8 %)	5/8

Overall Opinion of Content and Originality

Is the material covered adequately
Is the rational clear and logical
Originality - evidence that the students have thought about the issues and shown creativity
Comments: - Some contradictory statements
- Not a lot of thought put into issues and no hint of temporary or permanent solutions

Total (8 %)	4/8

Check List

Selected template is explicitly identified - No mention of template used	0/2
Title Page, with student names and numbers – No formatted title page, student numbers missing	0.5/1
Table of Contents – Present, but page numbering scheme is a mystery	0.5/1
List of Figures – N/A?	1/1
List of Tables – N/A?	1/1
Pages are numbered – No; ASCII plaintext file	0/1
Every figure has a caption and every table has a heading – No figures or tables	0/1
There is a section for the revision history – Doesn't exist	0/1
Introduction – follows selected template for the front matter and introduction – the pieces will typically include the system purpose (delineate purpose, specify intended audience), system scope, definitions, acronyms, abbreviations, references, system overview, roadmap of report Comments: Not clear what template was used, no roadmap. What is "the bump" or "Reminscence bump?" Why was the term "band" defined and never used?	2/3

General System Description – follows selected template to show an overview of the system – the pieces might include system modes and states (if appropriate), major system capabilities, major system conditions, major system constraints, user characteristics, assumptions and dependencies, operational dependencies and formal representations Comments: - Doesn't mention any system modes or any insight as to how this will work	1/3
Specific details – consistent with selected template – pieces might include ystem capabilities, conditions and constraints - physical (ex. environmental conditions), system performance, system security, information management, system operations (human factors, maintainability, reliability), policy and regulations, system life cycle, stage of requirements implementation Comments: - Mentions varguely about hardware, performance and security but doesn't explain anything about how the software interfaces with the database or how to maintain this	1.5/3
Identifies the technical (or other) risks that need to be tested during the proof of concept demonstration. Comments: - No mention of proof of concept at all	0/2
Requirements are abstract – Highly abstract	3/3
Requirements are unambiguous	1.5/3
Requirements are traceable	1/2
Requirements are validatable – "Should not take too long?"	1/2
Requirements are complete	1.5/2
Requirements are consistent	1.5/2
Requirements use symbolic parameters rather than values that are explicitly written into the requirements – N/A	2/2
All requirements are numbered (labelled)	2/2
Nonfunctional requirements are documented 1. Check a few nonfunctional requirements at random to see if they are validatable 2. safety requirement for not hurting anyone? 3. requirement related to the speed? 4. installability requirement for ease of installation?	2/3
Indication of how the requirements will be phased in over time –No roadmap for how this will be assembled	0/3
Document clearly shows the inputs to the system and the requirements for the determination of the outputs. – There is no tables or figures to show this, only have to go off of the product function (2.2)	3/8
Marketability mentioned (if appropriate) and off-the-shelf solutions – Data sources are entirely pre-existing commercialized off-the-shelf solutions	1.5/2
Open issues are identified (if appropriate) – part of PoC	2/2
The terms functional and nonfunctional requirements are used correctly	2/2
Key questions are asked by the evaluator on the project and then the answers are sought in the documentation and the quality of the answers is evaluated.	10/10

Repository is used for documentation. Access is available for all users, including TA and instructor. Reasonably frequent commits. Comments:	2/2
Provide substantive comments on another team's documentation. Comments: - The scope has statements that aren't clear or contradict each other - Never covered how they plan to interface with the Music Lab Database, ie: Android, iOS, Web, or Desktop applications - Non-functional requirement sections like software-interfaces and maintainability should be filled in as they are relevant - Poor formatting - No template mentioned	5.5/8
Total (of 102)	66/102
Total Mark (100%)	64.7/100