

# A5: Progress Report and Initial Design – Notes

The purpose of this document is to provide a progress report on your development. What have you completed so far compared to your requirements?

It should also document your information architecture and the design aspects (interfaces and system) of your project. Link back to your requirements that you identified in A2 and show where you are in your development process and any requirements that have been added, changed or removed.

***Note:** As each group is using different methodologies the marking for the planning documentation is based on the groups stated methodology requirements and practices.*

## FROM A2: PROJECT REQUIREMENTS DOCUMENTATION

---

You can use some of your sections in A2 for the basis of your A5 assignment, including:

- Project overview (group, client)
- Brief version of method overview (updated to show how it is actually being used)
- Requirements (modified and extended)

## OVERALL FEEDBACK FROM A2 AND A3 TO CONSIDER

---

The following are tips to help all groups improve their submissions in CSIT321:

- All groups must have strong internal branding; including a group name, logo, document templates, etc. This should be shown on your group website and throughout all your documentation.
- Requirements need to show dependencies and the current order of development
- For requirements you should be considering more than just functional requirements (FURPS+)
- If you state that you are using agile then you need to think about how you will be building a minimum viable product then developing on it in each iteration/sprint.
- Have you given yourself enough time to learn the new development stack?

## A5 ITEMS TO CONSIDER

---

A5 does not need to be a long written report. It needs to focus on how your development is occurring and your initial designs. You can use the interfaces that you have presented in A3 with any modifications identified during the presentation and from feedback with your client / supervisor.

Groups need to identify their progress based on their system requirements. This can mean identifying how far into the system development you actually are compared to where you wanted to be in your planning.

Groups need to provide their code (zipped file), readme on how to get running and details of their design as appendices to their report. If your system is a web application a URL to where I can review any prototypes could be provided.



# A5: Progress Report and Initial Design – Marking Document

The planning documentation should describe information architecture and design aspects of the project.

*As each group is using different methodologies the marking for the planning documentation is based on the groups stated methodology requirements and practices.*

<b>Project</b>	
<b>Group Members</b>	

Has the planning documentation and system been approved by the supervisor/client? Yes / No

Element	Good	Pass	Poor
<b>Report Structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Synthesis of material into relevant sections and flow in the presentation.</li> <li>- Moves from generalisations to specific conclusions.</li> <li>- Appropriate transitions within and between paragraphs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Basic flow from one section to the next.</li> <li>- Evidence of introduction and conclusion but not all sections logically flow.</li> <li>- Control over the structure of the document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No introduction or conclusion</li> <li>- Poor paragraph structure</li> <li>- Failure to recognise the task and respond with the appropriate document</li> </ul>
<b>Knowledge and analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Thorough understanding of key concepts / issues of the methodology chosen.</li> <li>- Ability to explain how these relate to the product/solution being designed.</li> <li>- Professional presentation of methodology used and high degree of precision and rigour in issues analysis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear understanding of key concepts / issues and some recognition of relationships between these.</li> <li>- Appropriate methodology listed and correct documentation for that methodology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Basic understanding of key issues / concepts.</li> <li>- Lack of coherent integration and synthesis of information.</li> <li>- Little or no critical engagement with the chosen methodology.</li> <li>- Incorrect modelling for the chosen methodology.</li> </ul>
<b>Information Architecture and System Design (Functional Requirements)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Professional discussion of the product/solution design features and why they were chosen.</li> <li>- Discussion throughout on why appropriate for the target audience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear discussion of the product/solution design features and why they were chosen.</li> <li>- Working initial prototypes of key functionality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limited discussion of the product/solution design features.</li> <li>- Basic development of a few functions</li> </ul>
<b>Interface Design (including user interaction)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall a professional design.</li> <li>- Professionally uses current design trends and methods.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall a clear design.</li> <li>- Improvements should be made to the final design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Basic design.</li> <li>- Major improvements needed to the final design.</li> </ul>
<b>Prototype</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Professional prototype that meets a number of the system's core features.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A good prototype that addresses some of the core system requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Basic prototype that is starting to meet some of core system features.</li> </ul>
<b>Report Presentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Absence of spelling mistakes and grammatical inconsistencies.</li> <li>- Superior, professional presentation and attention to detail</li> <li>- Matches group's branding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Relative absence of spelling or grammatical errors.</li> <li>- Formatting and style appropriate to the document.</li> <li>- Consistent with group's branding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spelling mistakes and grammatical inconsistencies.</li> <li>- Basic formatting.</li> <li>- No group branding.</li> </ul>
<b>Overall Comments</b>			
<b>Final Mark</b>			

