

# Guidelines and Submission Instructions

The IDD report must include the following components:

- A project description
- Software Requirement Specifications (SRS) documentation
- UI Wireframes and Prototype design process.

The IDD report style with all references and in-text citations used within the submitted process report must use the APA version7 format.

| Criteria                       | Weighting |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| Format and Project Description | 20%       |
| Mock-up and Wireframes         | 35%       |
| UI/ UX Prototyping             | 30%       |
| Presentation                   | 15%       |

## Assessment Tasks

Please follow the following guide to draft up your project proposal. Record any additional components you would like to add to your IDD report with a clear explanation. Make sure that your document and everything are in an academic format/ report.

### 1. Project Description and Format:

- a. Goals and Objectives (based on submitted proposal)
- b. Updated Timeline/Schedule and Project Constraints
- c. Using APA version-7 style and reference formatting.
- d. Feature list in your application
- e. Tools & Technologies:
  - i. Collaborative tools such as version control systems, user-testing, functional testing, and prototyping tools
  - ii. IDEs, programming languages and technologies used for application development.
  - iii. Components such as tools and/or services of the selected

### 2. SRS document – Functional and non-functional requirements, use-cases, class diagrams, activity diagrams

- a. Functional Requirements
- b. Non-functional Requirements
- c. Use-case diagrams of functional requirements
- d. Class diagrams
- e. Activity diagrams

### 3. UI/UX modelling

- a. Sketches and Lo-fi wireframes
- b. Hi-fi wireframes / Prototype

Note: Please ensure your project's process report is professionally written and formatted with APA version7 style.

## Performance Criteria (Rubric)

| Criteria & Weighting   |     | D Range<br>D- D D+   | C Range<br>C- C C+   | B Range<br>B- B B+  | A Range<br>A- A A+   |
|--|-----|--|--|---|--|
| 20%<br>Section I Project Description                                   |     |  |  |   |  |
| 1 a) Project Goals and objectives                                      | 6%  | Project goals and objectives are poorly identified and documented.<br><br>Little to no information about project timelines, constraints, team members and responsibilities have been provided.                     | Project goals and objectives are identified and documented to a minimal level.<br><br>Minimal details about project timelines, constraints, team members and responsibilities have been provided.  | Project goals and objectives are identified and documented to a good level.<br><br>Details about project timelines, constraints, team members' contribution and responsibilities have been sufficiently provided.   | Project goals and objectives are identified and documented to an excellent level.<br><br>Details about project timelines, constraints, team members' contribution and responsibilities have been elaborately provided.   |
| 1 b) Selection of Software Process model                               | %4  | Selection of software process model(s) is either not provided in the document or the selection is poorly justified.  | Selection of software process model(s) is done with some minimum justification provided in the document. Little research has been done about other process models before arriving at the final selection.  | Selection of software process model(s) is done with a good level of justification provided in the document. An adequate level of research about other process models has been done before arriving at the final selection.  | The selection of software process model(s) is made on the level of justification provided in the document. An excellent level of research about other process models has been done before arriving at the final selection.   |
| 1 c) Development and Deployment Tools, Languages and Technologies used | 5%  | List of collaborative tools, IDEs, programming languages, technologies, and frameworks to be used for the duration of the project is either missing or poorly articulated.   | List of collaborative tools, IDEs, programming languages, technologies, and frameworks to be used for the duration of the project has been documented with some missing details.   | List of collaborative tools, IDEs, programming languages, technologies, and frameworks to be used for the duration of the project has been documented with sufficient justification for their selection.  | List of collaborative tools, IDEs, programming languages, technologies, and frameworks to be used for the duration of the project has been documented with good justification for their selection.   |
| 1 d) Formatting of Project Description                                 | 5%  | Project description section of the report is poorly formatted. APA7 references and in-text citations are missing.  | Project description section of the report is formatted to an accepted level and has table of contents, page numbers, headers, footer and appropriate fonts. References are partially in APA7 format, and some in-text citations are missing.   | Project description section of the report is formatted to a good level with table of contents, page number, headers, footers, appropriate fonts, list of tables, list of figures. References mostly follow the APA7 format, and a few in-text citations are missing.  | Project description section of the report is formatted to an excellent level with table of contents, page number, headers, footers, appropriate fonts, list of tables, list of figures and appendices. References completely follow the APA7 format, and all in-text citations are present.  |
| 35%<br>Section II Software Requirements Specification (SRS)            |     |  |  |   |  |
| 2 a) Functional & Non-functional requirements with use-case diagram    | 20% | Functional and non-functional requirements are either not identified or very vaguely identified and poorly documented in the SRS document.<br><br>Few to no Use Case Diagrams have been drawn in the SRS document. | Functional and non-functional requirements of the system have been identified to a minimum level and minimally documented in the SRS document with some missing details.<br><br>At least 4 Use Case diagrams have been identified and drawn in the SRS diagram. Each use-case has been explained to a minimal level. | Functional and non-functional requirements of the system have been identified to a good level. They are documented in good detail but with less clarity in the SRS document.<br><br>At least 7 Use Case diagrams have been identified and drawn in the SRS document. These use-cases have been explained to a sufficient level. Moreover, Use Case diagrams are categorized for different users and modules in the system. Post-conditions and pre-conditions of use-cases are minimally articulated in a tabular form. | Functional and non-functional requirements of the system have been identified to an excellent level. They are clearly documented in excellent detail in the SRS document.<br><br>At least 10 Use Case diagrams have been identified and drawn in the SRS document. These use-cases have been explained to a highly detailed level. Moreover, Use Case diagrams are categorized for different users and modules in the system. Post-conditions and pre-conditions of use-cases are elaborately articulated in a tabular form. |
| 2 b) Class and Activity diagrams                                       | 15% | Few to no Class Diagrams have been drawn in the SRS document.<br><br>Few to no Activity Diagrams have been drawn in the SRS document.  | At least 2 classes have been represented in your class diagram. The assumptions, relationships/associations between these classes are minimally represented and articulated.<br><br>Activity diagrams for at least 1 key workflow (or use-cases) in the system have drawn and represented to a minimal level.        | At least 4 classes have been represented in your class diagram. The assumptions, relationships/associations between these classes are articulated to a good level.<br><br>Activity diagrams for at least 2 key workflows (or use-cases) in the system have drawn and represented to a good level.   | At least 4 classes have been represented in your class diagram. The assumptions, relationships/associations between these classes are articulated to an excellent level.<br><br>Activity diagrams for at least 3 key workflows (or use-cases) in the system have drawn and represented to an excellent level.  |

|  |      |   |  |  |   |
|--|------|---|--|--|---|
|  |      |   |  |  |   |
| 30%  |      |   |  |  |   |
| Section III UI/UX Prototyping                      |      |   |  |  |   |
| 3 a) Lo-fi sketches and lo-fi prototype/wireframes | 15%  | Images/screenshots of sketches and lo-fi wireframes have been provided with poor explanation.<br><br>Little to no evidence of usability testing is provided.  | Images/screenshots of sketches and lo-fi wireframes have been provided with a basic level of explanation.<br><br>Usability testing of lo-fi wireframes have been done to an adequate level. Lessons learnt from testing have been documented to a minimal level. | Images/screenshots of sketches and lo-fi wireframes have been provided with a good level of explanation.<br><br>Usability testing of lo-fi wireframes have been done to a good level. Lessons learnt from testing have been documented to an adequate level but with some less clarity. Lo-fi wireframes have undergone at least one iteration post usability testing. | Images/screenshots of sketches and lo-fi wireframes have been provided with an excellent level of explanation.<br><br>Usability testing of lo-fi wireframes have been done to an excellent level. Lessons learnt from testing have been clearly documented to an excellent level. Lo-fi wireframes have undergone multiple iterations and have been re-tested after each iteration. |
| 3 b) Hi-fi prototypes                              | 15%  | The hi-fi prototype is either missing or needs improvement. It poorly considers the lessons taken from user-testing of Lo-Fi wireframes.<br><br>Little to no evidence of user testing feedback for the hi-fi prototype is provided. | A decorated Hi-fi prototype has been provided. It utilises a few lessons taken from user-testing of the Lo-Fi Wireframes.<br><br>Evidence of testing feedback is minimally provided.   | A navigable, decorated Hi-fi prototype has been provided. It satisfactorily utilises lessons taken from user-testing of the Lo-Fi Wireframes.<br><br>Evidence of testing feedback is sufficiently provided.  | A fully navigable, decorated (images, icons, typography, style, etc.) prototype has been provided to a high standard regarding the UX Honeycomb. It clearly utilises lessons taken from user-testing of the Lo-Fi and Hi-Fi Wireframes.<br><br>Evidence of testing feedback is provided to a good level.  |
| 15%  |      |   |  |  |   |
| Section VII Project Presentation                   |      |   |  |  |   |
| 4 a) IDD Presentation (Contribution)               | 8%   | Poor contribution to the presentation. Presentation quality is poor.  | Minimal contribution to the presentation. Presentation quality is minimal.   | Sufficient contribution to the presentation. Presentation quality is sufficient.   | Contribution to the team presentation is excellent and evident. Ownership has been taken over equally portioned sections of the presentation. Excellent presentation quality is maintained for the respective section discussed.  |
| 4 b) Q/A time                                      | 7%   | In a group/ team project, a few students present and cannot answer questions.   | In a group/ team project, a few students present and be able to answer questions minimally.  | In a group/ team project, every student must present and be able to answer questions sufficiently.   | In a group/ team project, every student must present and be able to answer questions accurately.  |
| Total  | 100% |   |  |  |   |