Systems Development Group Project 2023-24

Task B part 1 – Report (75% of task)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Aims and Objectives | 10% |
| Literature Review | 15% |
| Project Planning & Team Roles | 20% |
| Requirements | 15% |
| Design and Test Plan | 15% |
| Implementation and Testing | 15% |
| Report Quality | 10% |
|  | Total: 100% |

Marking Criteria

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **100-86**  **Outstanding** | **85-70**  **Excellent** | **69-60**  **Very Good** | **59-50**  **Good** | **49-40**  **Adequate** | **39-30**  **Poor / Inadequate** | **29-0**  **Very Poor** |
| **Aims and**  **Objectives (10%)** | Aims and objectives **clearly stated. These satisfy the SMART properties.**  Aims and objectives have been **exceeded.** | * Aims and objectives **clearly stated.** * Aims and objectives have been **fully met**. * **Most demonstrate SMART Properties** | * Aims and objectives **clearly stated** * Aims and objectives have been **met.** * **Very good** work. | * Aims and objectives **clearly** **stated** * Aims and objectives have been **met to a good extent.** | * Aims and objectives **could be more clearly stated.** * Aims and objectives have been **met to some extent.** | * Aims and objectives **could be more clearly stated.** * Aimsand objectiveshave been **partially met**. | * Aims **barely** specified * Not clear if aims and objectives have been met. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **100-86**  **Outstanding** | **85-70**  **Excellent** | **69-60**  **Very Good** | **59-50**  **Good** | **49-40**  **Adequate** | **39-30**  **Poor / Inadequate** | **29-0**  **Very Poor** |
| **Literature Review**  **(15%)** | * **Outstanding** **analysis** of relevant works * Provides **critical** **review** of relevant applications **and** projects. * Demonstrates **outstanding insight** into the problem. * **Excellent** use of appropriate sources (both in quantity 10 - and quality). * All sources are **appropriately** **cited and referenced**. * It leads to the requirements section effectively. * Excellent Text flow. | * **Excellent** analysis of relevant works. * Provides **critical** review of relevant applications **and** research projects. * Demonstrates **excellent insight** into the problem. * **Excellent** use of appropriate sources (both in quantity 10 - and quality). * All sources are **appropriately** **cited and referenced**. * Some links to supporting the requirements. | * **Very good** analysis of relevant works * Provides **critical** **review** of relevant applications **and** projects. * Demonstrates **Very Good insigh**t into the problem. * **Good** use of sources. * All sources are **appropriately** **cited and referenced**. | * **Good** analysis of relevant works. * Provides a **good** **review** of relevant applications **and/or** projects. * Demonstrates **good insigh**t into the problem. * **Good** use of sources. * **Most** sources are **appropriately** **cited and referenced**. | * **Adequate** analysis of relevant works. * Provides **some** review of relevant applications **but** **lacks depth**. * Demonstrates **some insigh**t into the problem. * **Some Good** use of sources. Sources need to be **appropriately** **cited and referenced**. | * **Poor** analysis of relevant works. * Demonstrates **little or no insight** into the problem. | * **Little or no** analysis of relevant works is provided. |

**P**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **100-86**  **Outstanding** | **85-70**  **Excellent** | **69-60**  **Very Good** | **59-50**  **Good** | **49-40**  **Adequate** | **39-30**  **Poor / Inadequate** | **29-0**  **Very Poor** |
| **Project Planning & Team Roles**  **(20%)** | * **Outstanding Breakdown of tasks. Exceptionally well linked to the requirements and a very impressive Gantt Chart** * **A thorough analysis of risks, detailed evaluation, and planning against their impacts on the project.** * **Clear and consistent Risk Register.** | * **Excellent Breakdown of tasks. An Excellent link to the requirements and a very good Gantt Chart** * **An Excellent analysis of risks and planning against their impacts on the project.** | * **Very Good Breakdown of tasks. A Very Good attempt to link to requirements and to develop a Gantt Chart** * **A Very Good presentation of risks and assessment of their impacts on the plan** | * **Good** Breakdown of tasks. A Good attempt to link to requirements and to develop a Gantt Chart * **A Good attempt to present risks and assess their impacts on the plan** | * **Adequate** Breakdown of tasks. An adequate attempt to link to requirements and to develop a Gantt Chart | * **Poor** breakdown of tasks. Some attempt to produce a Gantt Chart | * **Little or no** planning. No diagrams or Gantt chart |

**r**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **100-86**  **Outstanding** | **85-70**  **Excellent** | **69-60**  **Very Good** | **59-50**  **Good** | **49-40**  **Adequate** | **39-30**  **Poor / Inadequate** | **29-0**  **Very Poor** |
| **Requirements**  **(15%)** | * **Outstanding** description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements * Requirements are linked to the literature review. * At least 6 appropriate functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | * **Excellent** description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements * Some links with the literature review are evident. * At least 6 appropriate functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | * **Very good** description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. * At least 6 **appropriate** functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | * **Good** description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. * At least 6 functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | * **Adequate** description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. * At least 6 functional and 6 non-functional requirements or combination of the two | * **Poor** description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. | * **Little or no** description, analysis, and presentation of the requirements. |

**tesign**

**(15%)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **100-86**  **Outstanding** | **85-70**  **Excellent** | **69-60**  **Very Good** | **59-50**  **Good** | **49-40**  **Adequate** | **39-30**  **Poor / Inadequate** | **29-0**  **Very Poor** |
| **Design and Test Plans**  **(15%)** | * **Provides and discusses in great detail** all design steps andappropriate diagrams and test plans * **Outstanding** presentation and discussion of the diagrams. | * **Provides and discusses in detail** all design steps and appropriate diagrams and test plans * **Excellent** presentation and discussion of the diagrams. | * **Provides and discusses clearly** all design steps and appropriate diagrams and test plans * **Very good** presentation and discussion of the diagrams | * **Provides and discusses** the design steps **of most of the** appropriate diagrams and suitable test plans * **Good** presentation and discussion of the diagrams. | * Design steps are **not clearly defined.** * Provides **some of the** appropriate diagrams and some test plans | * Design steps are **not clearly presented.** * Most diagrams are **missing**. | * **Little or no** presentation of required design steps * Mostdiagrams are **missing**. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **100-86**  **Outstanding** | **85-70**  **Excellent** | **69-60**  **Very Good** | **59-50**  **Good** | **49-40**  **Adequate** | **39-30**  **Poor / Inadequate** | **29-0**  **Very Poor** |
| **Implementation and Testing**  **(15%)** | * **Impressive** demonstration of programming and software development skills. * Demonstrates **outstanding insight** into the technologies employed. * Appropriate software testing; tests all aspects of the product in **great detail**. * **Outstanding reflection** on the tests’ results. | * **Excellent** demonstration of programming and software development skills. * Demonstrates **excellent insight** into the technologies employed. * Appropriate software testing; tests all aspects of the product in **great detail**. * **Excellent reflection** on the tests’ results. | * **Very** **good** demonstration of programming and software development skills. * Demonstrates **very good insight** into the technologies employed. * Appropriate software testing; tests all aspects of the product in **great detail**. * **Very good reflection** on the tests’ results. | * **Good** demonstration of programming and software development skills. * Demonstrates **good insight** into the technologies employed. * Appropriate software testing; tests **most** aspects of the product in **detail**. * **Good reflection** on the tests’ results. | * **Some** demonstration of programming and software development skills. * Demonstrates **some insight** into the technologies employed. * **Some or Poor** software testing; tests **some** aspects of the product. * **Some reflection** on the tests’ results. | * **Little or no** demonstration of programming and software development skills. * Demonstrates **some insight** into the technologies employed. * Poor software testing; tests **some** aspects of the product. * **Limited reflection** on the tests’ results. | * **Little or no** demonstration of programming skills. * Demonstrates **little or no insight** into the technologies employed. * **Little or no** software testing. * **Limited or no reflection** on the tests’ results. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark** | **100-86**  **Outstanding** | **85-70**  **Excellent** | **69-60**  **Very Good** | **59-50**  **Good** | **49-40**  **Adequate** | **39-30**  **Poor / Inadequate** | **29-0**  **Very Poor** |
| **Report Quality/**  **(10%)** | * Uses appropriate terminology **accurately**. * **Professionally** presented in both layout on the page and logical structure. * **Impressively** presented in an appropriate style. * Grammatically of an **extremely** **high** standard. * Results and products of the project **are** of publishable quality **comparable to** **or better than** that found in the products of professional companies. | * Uses appropriate terminology **accurately**. * **Professionally** presented in both layout on the page and logical structure. **Very** **well** presented in an appropriate style. * Grammatically of a **very** **high** standard. * Results and products of the project are **likely to be** of publishable quality in the professional world. | * A **good grasp** of the appropriate terminology. * **Well** presented in both layout on the page and logical structure. * Presented in an appropriate style. * **Good** grammatical standard. * Results and products of the project **would require some rewriting and improvement** to be of publishable quality in the professional world. | * **Mostly uses** appropriate terminology. * **Well** presented in both layout on the page and logical structure. * Presented in **reasonable** way which allows it to be easily read. * **Lacking** in clarity and grammatical structure. * Results and products of the project **would require significant rewriting and improvement** to be of publishable quality in the professional world. | * **Often fails** to use appropriate terminology. * **May lack** in layout and/or logical structure. * **May** show a **lack** of clarity and comprehension. * **Lacking** grammatical structure. * Results and products of the project are likely to be **poor** **and/or** **incomplete** and **well** **below** of what is expected in a junior role in a work environment. | * **Lack of or inaccurate** use of the appropriate terminology. * Typically **fails** to accurately or completely describe the work done * Will often contain **little indication** of which parts of the problem are understood and which are not. * **Often** shows a **lack** of structure, comprehension, clarity and grammatical quality. * Results and products of the project are **poor** and/or incomplete. | * **No use** of theappropriate terminology. * **Fails** to describe the problem and the work done. * Shows a **lack** of structure, comprehension, clarity and grammatical quality. Results and products of the project are **insignificant**, **poor** and/or **incomplete**. |