UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN - INF2011S
Project Demonstration Mark Sheet

Team Number:	Member 1: Name Student Number	Marker 1:	/ 100
	Member 2: Name Student Number	Marker 2:	Date and Time:

Presentation	Bare minimum 0 1	Acceptable quality, no frills 2	Good effort, flow and quality 3 4	Excellent flow, structure, quality 5	
• Punctuality and timing • Based on documented test cases • Flow of presentation – test cases must build a 'storyline	The presentation will be "driven" by the test cases (minimum 5). The set of test cases should test the "happy day" scenario and alternative / exceptional paths. For example, rooms might not be available, the guest might be in bad standing, the guest might not pay their deposit.				/5

Test Cases	Poor coverage; Not functioning as predicted; data unprepared 0 1 2	Average coverage; some functioning as predicted; data acceptable 3 4 5	Fair coverage, Most functioning as predicted; good data 6 7 8	Complete coverage; All functioning as predicted; excellent data 9 10	
• Coverage of functionality (5+ test cases) • Test Cases compatible with reality • All test cases successfully executed • Suitability of data – proper test database (test pack)	A test case must describe how to test a specific path through a use case. The test cases must be documented using the test case template used in the workshop and must be based on specified test data. The teams should have set up sample data to fit the test data specification provided and this should enable the team to demonstrate these outcomes.				/10

Functionality	Not done 0	Poorly attempted 1	Acceptable but problems 2 3	Good effort 4	Fully Functional 5	
1. Make a Booking 2. Change a Booking 3. Cancel a Booking 4. Make a Guest Booking Enquiry 5. Generate Occupancy Level Report + any other relevant Report	Focus here is on whether the system performs these tasks correctly – does it do the task correctly We will focus on elegance and integrity later.					/10 /10 /10 /5 /5
User Interface	Unaccept-able 0	Poor, below average, badly integrated 2	Basic, average, fairly standard 4 6	Nice touches, quite good 8	Consistently professional 10	
Navigation and Forms Interaction (5) • Intuitive interaction and dialog • System protects user (graying) Usability features (5) • Lookups and Drop-down boxes • Minimum keystrokes • Drag & drop, clever features • Can Backtrack if desired Screen layout and appearance (5) • Consistent screen layout • Standardisation; logical groupings • Colour Scheme	The three main issues here are the: • Elegant and intuitive nature of the interface • The use of appropriate screen controls (list boxes etc) • Standards and consistency					/5 /5 /5

Fault Tolerance	**Completely unusable** **0**	**Very unstable, many crashes** **1 2**	**Stable, but pretty weak validation, occasional crash** **3 4 5**	**Pretty stable, fair - good validation, good controls** **6 7 8**	**Bulletproof robust, tight controls** **9 10**	
Robustness of the system • Tendency to crash • Unpredictable operation • Rejects bad data correctly • Fault tolerant	How often did the system crash and can it handle "bad data".					**/10**
Integrity	**Database completely corrupted** **0**	**Data very unreliable** **1 2 3**	**Some corruption or incomplete data** **4 5 6**	**Good data quality, one or two small problem areas** **7 8 9**	**No errors** **10**	

Input integrity Controls :
• Data correctly updated in database
• Balances, totals add up
• Data Validation
  • Mandatory fields
  • Data validation controls
  • Enforcement of data consistency (e.g. titles; numbers; masks)
	Does the system look after it's data:
	• Is data correctly saved and retrieved.
	• Is the deposit correctly calculated
	• How well is input validated
						/10

General	**Bad system - little apparent effort** **0**	**Functional mostly works** **1**	**Good attempt Shows promise** **2 - 3**	**Professional; Big effort** **4**	**Exceeds expectations** **5**	
• Evidence of effort • General quality • Professionalism in evidence						**/5**

Optional Additional Features (Bonus)	**No impact on project** **0**	**Very little impact** **1**	**Useful feature** **2 - 3**	**Extensive functionality** **4**	**Major contribution** **5**	
• Must contribute to system – make business sense	These features are not necessarily part of the test cases used in the demo – ask for extra demo of additional features					**/10**

Code Walkthrough	**Unaccepable** **0**	**Poor** **1**	**Average** **2 - 3**	**Good** **4**	**Excellentn** **5**	
• Ask the team to walk through aspects of their code and discuss what is does • Review the quality of code submitted						**/5**

Comments