



**CSCC40 (Fall 2010)**

**Wael Aboulsaadat**

**Assignment 2 Marking**

**Marker:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Team:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Marks:** \_\_\_\_\_/100

Marks for this assignment depend on the factors and criteria listed below.

**A: Requirements Specification (40%)** \_\_\_\_\_

*A1. Problem identification.*

How well have you researched the problem, and the organization you are dealing with; how well do you describe the alternative you have selected.

**Marks:** \_\_\_\_\_/10

\* Synopsis of the problem:

worst description in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* Description of the proposed alternative:

worst description in my pile                       average                       one of the best

*A2: Requirements Specification.*

How complete, well-thought out and organized are the requirements for the new system?

**Marks:** \_\_\_\_\_/30

\* Functional (software) requirements

worst description in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* Non-functional requirements (performance, platform, interface, etc)

worst description in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* Are the requirements numbered and well organized? Are they complete, consistent, unambiguous, traceable, etc.

no     partially                       yes

\* Are data to be managed by the system described? System interfaces with other systems?

worst description in my pile                       average                       one of the best

**B: UML Diagrams (40%) \_\_\_\_\_**

Figures, diagrams and discussion that lead the reader to believe that the requirements you have specified are complete and appropriate for the proposed system.

**Value 40**

**marks: \_\_\_\_\_**

*B1. Use Case Diagrams.*

**marks: \_\_\_\_\_/10**

\* (Informal) Description of each Use Case Diagram.

worst description in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* For each use case, there is a relevant entry in the data dictionary.

yes     no

\* Discussion of the diagrams and how they relate to the requirements.

worst discussion in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* Quality of the diagrams (choose one).

A- Poor selection - few if any Use Cases are appropriate.

B- Some valid attempt has been made at identifying Use Cases. Perhaps some serious flaws or omissions.

C- All high level Use Case description documented. Perhaps some are inappropriate.

D- Some relevant expanded version of Use Cases included. Sensible structuring of Use Cases. Only minor errors.

E- Exhaustive treatment of Use Cases. All relevant relationships have been captured.

*B2. Class Diagrams.*

**marks: \_\_\_\_\_/15**

\* A relevant report derived from the data dictionary has been included.

yes     partially                       no

\* Classes are fully consistent.

yes     partially                       no

\* Adequate use of CL to define class invariants, also operation pre/post-conditions.

yes     partially                       no

\* Quality of the class model (choose one).

A- Poor selection - few if any classes are appropriate

B- Some valid attempt has been made at identifying classes. Perhaps some serious flaws or omissions.

C- Some sensible decisions documented. Perhaps some are inappropriate.

D- Nearly all relevant decisions included and suitably justified. Any errors are minor.

E- Exhaustive treatment of issues, fully consistent & imaginatively justified.

\* (Informal) Description of Class Diagrams.

worst description in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* Discussion of the diagrams and how they relate to the requirements.

worst discussion in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* Quality of the diagrams (choose one).

A- Little or no attempt to create them, or to structure them.

B- Some valid attempt has been made at structuring. Perhaps some serious flaws or omissions.

C- Some sensible structuring. Perhaps some essential structuring is inappropriate or missing.  
Some use of navigability, multiplicity, roles, etc.

D- Nearly all structuring well designed. Navigability fully justified. Includes multiplicities, roles, etc.

E- All relationship well structured. Consistent with case study, and imaginatively justified.

### *B3. Interaction and State Diagrams*

**marks: \_\_\_\_\_/15**

\* (Informal) Description of Interaction Diagrams.

worst description in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* (Informal) Description of State Diagrams.

worst description in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* Discussion of these artifacts and how they relate to the requirements

worst discussion in my pile                       average                       one of the best

\* Quality of the diagrams (choose one).

A- Little or no attempt, or really does not understand the Interaction and State Diagram notation.

B- Some valid attempt made, but only for obvious interactions, etc. Perhaps Use Cases are not well-thought out.

C- Reasonable attempt. Perhaps some interactions/events are inappropriate or inconsistent.  
Use Case may not have been prepared with enough care.

D- Sound & complete diagrams. Most interactions/events are appropriate and consistent with all other diagrams.

E- Complete & imaginative, fully consistent with case study & justified by imaginative assumptions.

**C. Report (10%)** \_\_\_\_\_

Covers the overall structure of the report. This includes appendices that describe meetings, diagrams, data dictionary and other information on the preparation of the assignment.

**Value 10**

**marks:** \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Presentation (10%)** \_\_\_\_\_

This component of the marking scheme evaluates the style of your presentation, including language, grammar, clarity of the presentation, organization of appendices, etc.

**Value 10**

**marks:** \_\_\_\_\_

worst presentation in my pile

average

one of the best