# Design and Professional Practice 2 Product Specification Document Marking Criteria

### Objective

The Product Specification Document (PSD) captures what the solution is required to do to fulfil the user needs. The document is intended to help designers understand more about how the product is intended to be used. It is not intended to describe the product or specific design decisions.

### **Document Format**

The PSD should include information about the functionality and performance of the solution, physical limitations, environment of use, safety and legal requirements. A template is provided on both Blackboard and Teams as a guide for you and the lecture slides provide information regarding the expected content of each section.

### Submission

The PSD should be no more than 5 pages long (this limit does not include references).

The first submission date is for a draft submission for formative assessment to give you feedback. The second deadline is for the final submission.

A pdf of the document should be submitted on Turnitin, be sure to use the following title formats when naming your files:

BME Group X – PSD.pdf or Mol Group Y – PSD.pdf

# Marking Criteria

The following criteria are attributes that we will be looking for in your submitted Product Specification Document.

| Aspect       | Criteria   |
|--------------|--|
|              | <ul> <li>Demonstrating in depth background research into the topic (depth).</li> </ul> |
| Background   | • Demonstrating good coverage of all areas of the topic (breadth).                     |
| Research     | • Utilises relevant resources such as standards, legal documentation,                  |
|              | regulations and best practice guides.  |
|              | <ul> <li>Uses the correct citation of relevant references.</li> </ul>                  |
|              | <ul> <li>Account has been made of the target end-users.</li> </ul>                     |
| User         | <ul> <li>Account has been made of the different use scenarios.</li> </ul>              |
| Requirements | <ul> <li>Account has been made of the use environment and conditions.</li> </ul>       |
|              | <ul> <li>Account has been made of the lifecycle of the product.</li> </ul>             |
|              | Suitable technical specifications are provided including appropriate                   |
|              | values for assessment.   |
| Technical    | Technical requirements are Specific.   |
| Content      | <ul> <li>Technical requirements are Measurable.</li> </ul>                             |
|              | <ul> <li>Technical requirements are Achievable.</li> </ul>                             |
|              | <ul> <li>Technical requirements align with User requirements.</li> </ul>               |
|              | <ul> <li>Appropriate testing techniques have been selected.</li> </ul>                 |
| Testing      | <ul> <li>Adequate detailing of testing is included.</li> </ul>                         |
|              | <ul> <li>Testing is achievable within the scope of the project.</li> </ul>             |
|              | Good understanding of the purpose of the PSD is demonstrated by                        |
|              | the content which has been included.   |
| Writing      | <ul> <li>Good understanding of what content is suitable for the relevant</li> </ul>    |
|              | sections of the PSD is demonstrated.   |
|              | <ul> <li>Appropriate technical language is used to detail specifications.</li> </ul>   |

# **Grade Descriptors**

| Cuerda | Mark   | Channa stania stian   |
|--------|--------|---|
| Grade  | Range  | Characterisation  |
| A*     | 85-100 | The work is exemplary and is potentially publishable with minimal<br>further editing.<br>Complex observations and evaluations of the background literature<br>have been made.<br>A thorough examination of the user needs and requirements is<br>provided.<br>Complete technical requirements specification including appropriate<br>and practical tests is demonstrated. |
| A      | 70-84  | The work is very good and of a publishable standard with significant<br>additional editing.<br>Careful observations and evaluations of the background literature<br>have been made.<br>A strong examination of the user needs and requirements is provided.<br>Many technical requirements specification including appropriate and<br>practical tests are included.       |
| В      | 60-69  | The work is good.<br>Good observations and evaluations of the background literature have<br>been made, but few are complex.<br>Some examination of the user needs and requirements.<br>Adequate technical requirements specification including tests as<br>shown.   |
| С      | 50-59  | The work is mostly sound.<br>Observations and evaluations of the background literature are largely<br>satisfactory but lack detail in one or more aspects.<br>Examination of some user needs.<br>Some technical requirements specification including tests are<br>included.   |
| D      | 40-49  | The work is sound in parts but falls below a satisfactory standard in<br>several areas.<br>Only general observations and evaluations of the background<br>literature have been made.<br>Listing of several user needs.<br>A few technical requirements are noted including tests.   |
| E      | 30-39  | The work fails to reach an acceptable standard in most areas.<br>Few observations and evaluations of the background literature have<br>been made and many of those that have been made are flawed.<br>Minimal examination of the user needs.  |

| Limited technical requirements are noted without the proper |
|---|
| consideration for practical tests.                          |