

Aromatawai / Assessment Marks: BIT607v1 - AS1**Otinga / Result** 78.00 / 100.00**Ōrau / Percentage** 78 %

Jigneshkumar Maheshvari (5073878)

He āpitihanga kōrero / Overall Comments

Good work! Please go through the feedback to understand the shortcomings. Thanks for choosing Open Polytechnic.

Task 1**Otinga wāhanga /
Section Result****32.00 / 35.00****TASK 1: Analyse requirements from the project brief****Part 1: User-centred design**

- For each external stakeholder:
 - o create a persona, including, for each persona, the following information:
 - ☐ personal – age and occupation
 - ☐ professional – web experience, web usage and a short description of their personal and professional background
 - ☐ technical – device, operating system, browser and a short description of their technical background
 - ☐ motivation – typing skills, computer literacy, accessibility (if applicable) and a short description behind their motivation in using your web application.
 - o create two user stories.
 - Create a scenario for each user story. Each scenario must include a user, reason and goal.
 - For each scenario, create a use case. Each use case must include an actor, goal, tasks and endpoint.
 - For each use case, create a flow diagram.

In summary, for Part 1 of Task 1, should create four (4) personas, eight (8) user stories, eight (8) scenarios, eight (8) use cases, and eight (8) flow diagrams.

Paearu Aromatawai / Assessment Criteria**Otinga / Result:****20.00 / 20.00**

16-20 marks	13-15.5 marks	10-12.5 marks	8-9.5 marks	1-7.5 marks
<p>Comprehensively and realistically described personas cover all required aspects (personal, professional, technical, motivation).</p> <p>Comprehensive and well-structured user stories are directly related to project goals.</p> <p>Comprehensive scenarios with well-defined users, reasons and goals that align with selected user stories.</p> <p>Well-structured use cases with all components (use case, actor, goal, tasks, endpoint) comprehensively defined and aligned with the scenarios.</p> <p>Well-designed flow diagrams that logically represent the steps in the use cases.</p>	<p>Adequately described personas cover all required aspects.</p> <p>Adequate user stories that are relevant to project goals.</p> <p>Adequate scenarios that are aligned to selected user stories.</p> <p>Adequate use cases with all components defined and aligned with scenarios.</p> <p>Clear flow diagrams that logically represent steps.</p>	<p>Personas are adequately described but may have one or two omissions.</p> <p>User stories are clear and relate to project goals.</p> <p>Scenarios are clear but may have one or two minor misalignments with selected user stories.</p> <p>Use cases are adequate with components defined and aligned with scenarios but may have one or two minor gaps.</p> <p>Flow diagrams are generally clear and represent steps with one or two minor gaps or inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Personas are somewhat described but lack depth in some aspects.</p> <p>Vague user stories that are remotely related to project goals.</p> <p>Scenarios are presented but lack clarity or alignment to selected user stories.</p> <p>Use cases lack clarity or completeness in defining components or alignment.</p> <p>Flow diagrams are incomplete or do not clearly represent steps.</p>	<p>Unclear personas, missing key aspects.</p> <p>Unclear user stories that are not related to project goals.</p> <p>Unclear scenarios not related to selected user stories.</p> <p>Unclear use cases missing key components or alignment.</p> <p>Very unclear flow diagram not related to use case steps.</p>

Tākupu / Marking Comments

All ok.

1. Part 2: Identify requirements

- For your web application, identify ten functional requirements and five non-functional requirements.
- Categorise your requirements using the MoSCoW method (M – must have, S – should have, C – could have and W – will not have).
- For each requirement, explain why it falls into the M, S, C or W category.
- Present your information using the table.

Paearu Aromatawai / Assessment Criteria			Otinga / Result:	12.00 / 15.00
12-15 marks	10-11.5marks	7.5-9.5 marks	6-7 marks	1-5.5 marks
Clearly identified and justified ten functional and five non-functional requirements, categorised accurately with comprehensive explanations for MoSCoW categorisation.	Identified and justified ten functional and five non-functional requirements, categorised accurately with clear explanations for MoSCoW categorisation.	Identified ten functional and five non-functional requirements, with generally correct categorisation. Some explanations for MoSCoW categorisation are provided but may lack depth.	Identified ten requirements, but categorisation lacks clarity or explanations for MoSCoW categorisation are insufficient.	Identified fewer than ten requirements and explanations for MoSCoW categorisation are unclear or incomplete.
Tākupu / Marking Comments				
<p>It is a standard industry practice to number the requirements, this way they are easier to refer to.</p> <p>"Be accessible for mobile devices" -- this is a non-functional requirement as it describes an attribute.</p> <p>"Audiovisual elements in the presentation" -- this is a non-functional requirement as it describes an attribute.</p>				
Task 2			Otinga wāhanga / Section Result	16.00 / 20.00

TASK 2: Feasibility study comparing web development options

Complete a feasibility study for your web application that analyses one web application builder and one self-hosted CMS.

Choose one from each of the following development options:

- web application builder – Shopify, Squarespace or WordPress.com
- self-hosted CMS – SilverStripe, Umbraco or WordPress.org.

Your feasibility study must include:

- a project description
- a comparison of two development options using the following evaluation criteria:
 - o functionality
 - o integration
 - o content
 - o customisation
 - o scalability
 - o maintenance
 - o system
 - o security
 - o cost.
- a conclusion that considers which development option meets most of the evaluation criteria and will allow you to meet the must-have requirements.

Present your information using the table.

Paearu Aromatawai / Assessment Criteria			Otinga / Result:	16.00 / 20.00
16-20 marks	13-15.5 marks	10-12.5 marks	8-9.5 marks	1-7.5 marks
Thorough feasibility study with a well-structured project description, comprehensive comparison of functionality, integration, content, customisation, scalability, maintenance, system, security and cost between the selected web application builder and self-hosted CMS. Includes a well-supported conclusion based on evaluation criteria.	Feasibility study includes an adequate project description and a clear comparison of all aspects, such as functionality, integration, content, customisation, scalability, maintenance, system, security and cost. Conclusion considers which option meets most evaluation criteria with clear support.	Feasibility study provides an adequate project description and a comparison of most aspects, such as functionality, integration, content, customisation, scalability, maintenance, system, security and cost. The conclusion addresses which option meets many of the evaluation criteria with reasonable support.	Feasibility study lacks clarity or completeness in project description, comparison or conclusion. Some evaluation criteria are not addressed.	Feasibility study is very unclear or incomplete in project description, comparison or conclusion. Most evaluation criteria are not addressed.
Tākupu / Marking Comments				
Under costs, actual or near actual costs should be provided to make the comparison as realistic as possible.				
The conclusion is vague, it does not clearly prefer one over the other.				

Task 3	Otinga wāhanga / Section Result	20.00 / 25.00
---------------	--	----------------------

TASK 3: Structure your web application

Part 1: Produce a site map

- Your site map must display five web pages: Home, Services, Gallery, Booking and Contact.
- Give a clear indication of the hierarchy of the site and the flow between pages.
- Each page must have a title and bullet point list of the content you plan for each page.

Paearu Aromatawai / Assessment Criteria	Otinga / Result:	8.00 / 10.00
--	-------------------------	---------------------

8-10 marks	6.5-7.5 marks	5-6 marks	4-4.5 marks	1-3.5 marks
Site map displays five web pages (Home, Services, Gallery, Booking, Contact) with clear hierarchy and flow between pages. Each page has a title and a bullet point list of planned content. Digital diagram is professional quality, effectively illustrating site map structure.	Site map displays five pages with hierarchy and flow but may have one or two minor illogical sequences between pages. Titles and content lists are mostly clear but may lack specificity or consistency. Diagram is clear but may have minor visual inconsistencies.	Site map displays five pages with some hierarchy and flow, but it lacks clarity and logical sequences between pages. Titles and content lists are present but may be vague or incomplete. Diagram has visual inconsistencies, making it somewhat difficult to understand page connections or hierarchy.	Site map displays five pages, but hierarchy or flow between pages is unclear or not effectively shown. Titles and content lists are incomplete or lack clarity. Diagram lacks visual clarity, making it difficult to understand page connections or hierarchy.	Site map structure is unclear, making it difficult to understand hierarchy or flow between pages. Titles and content lists are vague or not clearly related. Diagram is difficult to interpret due to poor visual presentation or layout.

Tākupu / Marking Comments

The table is unnecessary, it could have been part of the diagram.

3. Part 2: Produce wireframes

For each web page (home, services, gallery, booking and contact):

- create a digital desktop and mobile display wireframe
- consider how sections of the web page will need to change to display on mobile; that is, navigation and font size
- note the screen dimension (width and height in pixels) and version 1 in the bottom right-hand corner.

Paearu Aromatawai / Assessment Criteria			Otinga / Result:	12.00 / 15.00
12-15 marks	10-11.5 marks	7.5-9.5 marks	6-7 marks	1-5.5 marks
Digital desktop and mobile wireframes for each web page (Home, Services, Gallery, Booking, Contact) are comprehensive and well-designed, considering how sections adapt for mobile (for example, navigation and font size). Screen dimensions and versions are correctly noted in the bottom right corner.	Wireframes are detailed and well-designed for desktop and mobile, considering most aspects of mobile adaptation. Screen dimensions and versions are noted but may have one or two minor errors.	Wireframes are detailed and satisfactorily designed for desktop and mobile, considering some aspects of mobile adaptation. Screen dimensions and versions may be noted but with errors or inconsistencies.	Wireframes are somewhat detailed but may lack consideration for mobile adaptation. Screen dimensions or versions may be noted but with errors and inconsistencies.	Wireframes are unclear, missing key details and do not consider mobile adaptation. Screen dimensions or versions are incorrect.
Tākupu / Marking Comments				
Version and dimension details are not present.				
Task 4			Otinga wāhanga / Section Result	10.00 / 20.00

TASK 4: Seeking feedback on wireframes

Task 4 draws on the work you completed in task 3, part 2.

For the Services, Gallery and Booking web pages, identify two tasks a business owner should try to perform. These tasks should be typical actions a user might take when using the site.

Write three questions you will ask a business owner during the testing session to gather more information about the accessibility and usability of your wireframes.

Ask a colleague, relative or friend to act as a business owner for you. Conduct a testing session where the stakeholder can:

- view your digital desktop and mobile display wireframes
- respond to your questions.

Following the testing session, write a summary of your results covering the following:

- List the tasks you set for a business owner to perform.
- List the three questions you asked a business owner to consider.
- Explain how your chosen questions will prompt user information that will help you improve your wireframes.
- Summarise your observations of a business owner's approach to the tasks and any feedback you received.
- How will you incorporate the user feedback you received into your wireframes? Will you need to make any changes? Why or why not?

Make any changes to the wireframes and note version 2 in the bottom right-hand corner.

Paearu Aromatawai / Assessment Criteria			Otinga / Result:	10.00 / 20.00
16-20 marks	13-15.5 marks	10-12.5 marks	8-9.5 marks	1-7.5 marks
Comprehensive summary including detailed tasks for the business owner, well-designed questions to gather insights on accessibility and usability, thorough explanation of how questions will help improve wireframes, detailed observations and feedback and a clear plan for incorporating feedback into wireframes. Versions are correctly noted in the bottom right.	Detailed summary including tasks for the business owner, adequate questions for accessibility and usability insights, clear explanation of how questions will help improve wireframes, good observations and feedback and a clear plan for incorporating feedback into wireframes. Versions are noted but may have minor errors.	Adequate summary including tasks for the business owner, reasonable questions for accessibility and usability insights, reasonable explanation of how questions will help improve wireframes, good observations and feedback and a reasonable plan for incorporating feedback into wireframes. Versions may be noted but with errors or inconsistencies.	Somewhat detailed summary with tasks for the business owner questions for accessibility and usability insights, limited explanation of how questions will help improve wireframes, basic observations and feedback and a partial plan for incorporating feedback into wireframes. Versions may be noted but with errors and inconsistencies.	Unclear summary missing key components, such as tasks, questions, explanations, observations, feedback or a plan for incorporating feedback into wireframes. Versions are incorrect.
Tākupu / Marking Comments				
"What is the opinion on the low for booking?" -- this question is unclear, what is it trying to uncover?				
"How does the Service page and detail page look?" -- this question is broad and does not try to explore much?				
"One key issue was that the booking process didn't display staff availability. I addressed this by incorporating that step into the updated version of the design." -- this indicates design change. However, no further details have been provided and there is no updated wireframe				