

Submission One - Your project proposal

You should upload your individual submission for this first deliverable. This should include your project proposal and the work that you have done so far. You can see the rubric (attached) which covers the marking criteria for this particular assessment.

-

 [rubric.pdf](#)


8 October 2020, 11:50 AM


Submission status

Submission status	Submitted for grading
Grading status	Graded
Due date	Saturday, 12 December 2020, 11:59 PM
Time remaining	Assignment was submitted 1 day 6 hours early
Last modified	Friday, 11 December 2020, 5:44 PM


File submissions

-

 [Submission.zip](#)

 Turnitin ID: 139301230

x



11 December 2020, 5:44 PM

Submission comments

▶

[Comments \(0\)](#)

Edit submission

Remove submission

You can still make changes to your submission.

Feedback

Grade	17 / 30
Graded on	Wednesday, 20 January 2021, 10:09 PM

Feedback
comments

There is a well defined set of objectives but some clarity of expression missing in terms of deliverables and/or strategies for completion of tasks. Some reasonable effort has been made to provide a plan of action though this is not entirely clear or complete. Some elements of the system are specified to a sufficient level of detail. Some aspects are missing, incomplete or not described to a sufficient level of detail. Some effort has been made to define/describe the scope and limitations of the system, though the deliverables are not sufficiently clear or well defined. There is some evidence of requirements elicitation involving some key stakeholders and some considerations taken into account regarding their involvement. The research summary is exhaustive, highlighting key research in the field and signifying the relevance to the project. The analysis of similar tools is comprehensive, giving a good account of the state-of-the-art. There is sufficient detail to understand the relevance of the proposed design in its given space. The description of approaches that discuss the motivations and reasoning for working in a particular manner are clear, concise and well evidenced. The techniques proposed are fit for purpose. There is evidence of prototyping, though the prototyping phases are incomplete and/or missing important levels of detail. There is not a clear body of evidence of justifiable iteration between stages. There is some early evidence of assumption testing and validation of your designs that you plan to do, though this is incomplete and lacking important details. There is some evidence of analysis and evaluation, though this is incomplete in nature. The level of detail provided here is not sufficient to consider whether the project is likely to be successful/fail based on insufficient evidence in reasoning.

Grade: 57%

Some understanding of fundamental concepts of system and software development lifecycles, with a consistent and clear approach to the work. Concepts and ideas are present in a meaningful way and the work shows a good grasp of the software development lifecycle and an approach to building and evaluating software in an iterative, collaborative way.

◀ Weekly Check In

Jump to...

Late submission assignment 1 - for
RASA students or approved extensions

