

DIT045 Assignment 1: Rubric

Fall 2017

Summary

Section	Grade	Out of
Submission Basics	0	3 (can be negative)
Part 1: Requirements Modeling	35	82
1a: Context Diagram	0	15
1b: Goal Model	21	30
1c: Use Case Diagram	11	20
1X) Consistency	2	9
1d: Reflection	1	8
Part 2: Natural Language Requirements	46	90
2a: SRS-Style Requirements	14	34
2b: User Stories	20	27
2c: Requirements Template	3	5
2d: Structured Text	2	7
2X) Consistency	7	9
2e: Reflection	0	8
Total	81	175
%	46,2857142857143	100

Submission Basics

Assignment received:

Yes	No
Continue Marking	Mark of 0 given

Days Late:

0	1	2	3+
---	---	---	----

100% of final mark	80% of final mark	60% of final mark	Mark of 0 given
--------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------

Assignment in PDF:

Yes	No
Do nothing	- 5 points

Group Evaluation form:

Missing	Present but Incomplete	Present and Complete
- 5 points	-2 points	Do Nothing

Cover page includes complete information:

- The name of the course
- The date
- Your group name
- Your group members
- Which Problem Domain was selected
- The number of pages in the assignment

No Cover page	Partial Information	Complete Information
0	1	3

0 / 3 (note, can be negative or a - %)

Part 1: Requirements Modeling

1a: Context Diagram

System Actor

Does not have a system actor	System actor present, but not in center or not obvious which it is or naming off	System actor present, in center, easy to find, sensible name
0	1	3

Relevant Stakeholders

No Stakeholders	A few Relevant Stakeholder	Most Relevant Stakeholders, but some missing	Many Relevant Stakeholders
0	1	2	3

Relationships

No Relationships	A few relationships, most inputs and outputs missing or not sensible	Some relationships, most have relevant inputs and outputs	Many relationships with relevant inputs and outputs
------------------	--	---	---

0	1	2	3
---	---	---	---

Syntax

Model breaks many rules for context models, does not look like a context model	Many syntax issues	A few syntax issues	No issues in syntax
0	1	2	3

Readability/Layout

Model is very hard to read	Model is readable, some issues	Model clear, easy to read
0	1	3

Marker Comments/Feedback:

The model was not delivered.

0 / 15

1b: Goal Model

System Actor (one or more)

Does not have a system actor	One or more system actors present, but not clearly name, hard to identify	One or more system actor present, clearly identifiable
0	1	3

Relevant Actors/Stakeholders

No Stakeholders	A few Relevant Stakeholder	Most Relevant Stakeholders, but some missing	Many Relevant Stakeholders
0	1	2	3

Dependencies

No Dependencies	Some dependencies but missing obvious ones	Some problems	Most obvious dependencies present
0	1	2	3

Goals

No Goals	Some goals but missing obvious ones	Some problems	Most obvious goals present
0	1	2	3

Qualities

No qualities	Some qualities but missing obvious ones	Some problems	Most obvious qualities present
0	1	2	3

Tasks/Resources

No tasks or resources	Some tasks and/or resources but missing obvious ones	Some problems	Most obvious tasks and resources present
0	1	2	3

AND/OR Refinement

No AND/OR Refinements	Some AND/OR Refinements but missing obvious ones	Some problems	Most obvious AND/OR Refinements present
0	1	2	3

Contribution Links (Capturing Trade-offs)

No Contribution Links	Some Contribution Links but missing obvious ones	Some problems	Most obvious Contribution Links present
0	1	2	3

Syntax

Model breaks many rules for context models, does not look like a goal model	Many syntax issues	A few syntax issues	No issues in syntax
0	1	2	3

Readability/Layout

Model is very hard to read	Model is readable, some issues	Model clear, easy to read
0	1	3

Marker Comments/Feedback:

Developer is not an actor of your system. All the tasks inside this actor needs to be done before the system is available to the user apart from update the system. You could have an administrator to be responsible for this goals. The goal of an investor is not to make money, but to invest money. Most of the quality on Owner, User, security system, e-bike helper system are goals. Some of the tasks are unclear, for example “Choose a high level of help” what do you mean by that? Why the task “Assist resellers” on customer Support is not connected to the Reseller? Why the security system is not connected to any other actor?

21 / 30

1c: Use Case Diagram

System Boundary

Does not have a system boundary box	The system has boundary but not name or vice-versa	Has system boundary box
0	1	2

Relevant Stakeholders

No Stakeholders	A few Relevant Stakeholder	Several stakeholders, some obvious missing	Many Relevant Stakeholders
0	1	2	3

Relevant Use Cases

No Use Cases	A few Use Cases	Several use cases, some obvious ones missing	Many Relevant Use Cases
0	1	2	3

Relationships from Use Cases to Stakeholders

No Relationships	A few relationships	Many relationships
0	1	3

Relationships between Use Cases

No Relationships	A few relationships	Many relationships
0	1	3

Syntax

Model breaks many rules for context models, does not look like a use case model	Many syntax issues	A few syntax issues	No issues in syntax
0	1	2	3

Readability/Layout

Model is very hard to read	Model is readable, some issues	Model clear, easy to read
0	1	3

Marker Comments/Feedback:

Owner and user what is the difference? Owner of what? It looks like the owner is the user. Who is paying and where? The use cases needs to be Verb Noun format, for example: "get the bike location data" could be get location or get bike location. Some of your use cases contains more than one, such as "get reports and usage data". There are a lot of words misspelled.

11 / 20

1X) Consistency

Actors/Stakeholders in the Context, Goal, and Use Case model are consistent

No consistency	Very little consistency	Some consistency	Mostly consistent
0	1	2	3

Relationships in the Context Diagram are reflected in the Goal Model (typically with dependencies) and Vice Versa

No consistency	Very little consistency	Some consistency	Mostly consistent
0	1	2	3

Use cases in the Use Case diagram are reflected in the Goal Model and Vice Versa

No consistency	Very little consistency	Some consistency	Mostly consistent
0	1	2	3

Marker Comments/Feedback:

The goal model has 12 actors while the use case has 5. Costumer support (goal) and costumer service (use case) names are different. The context model wasn't present.

2 / 9

1d: Reflection

Q1: updates

Not answered	Answered, but not clear, missing part, or fairly obvious	Thoughtful clear response answering all of the questions
0	1	2

Q2: difficulties

Not answered	Answered, but not clear, missing part, or fairly obvious	Thoughtful clear response answering all of the questions
0	1	2

Q13: benefits and drawbacks

Not answered	Answered, but not clear, missing part, or fairly obvious	Thoughtful clear response answering all of the questions
0	1	2

Style

Answers very hard to read and understand, many errors	Answers understandable, but some issues in clarity, grammar, spelling or punctuation.	Thoughtful clear response answering all of the questions
0	1	2

Marker Comments/Feedback:

The text was very confusing, you tried to combine the two reflections asked in one. The explanations and details were very poorly done. The text has a lot of mistakes and the flow was hard to follow.

1 / 8

Part 2: Natural Language Requirements

2a: SRS-Style Requirements

Quantity

No SRS requirements	< 5 SRS requirements	5-9 SRS Requirements	10+ SRS requirements
0	1	2	3

Type Correctness (functional, quality, constraint)

Type of requirement not identified	Type sometime identified or several identifications wrong	Type always identified, mostly correctly
0	1	2

Type Coverage (functional, quality, constraint)

Missing a type of requirement	At least one of every type captured correctly	At least two of every type captured correctly
0	1	2

SRS Qualities:

Quality	Poor	OK	Good
Feasible	Several unrealistic	Some feasibility issues with a few requirements	Most requirements feasible to implement
Verifiable	Several requirements not testable	Some difficult to verify	Most requirements clearly testable
Modifiable	Requirements not numbered	Some numbers, some cross-references	All requirements numbered, minimal cross-references
Valid/Traceable	Not clear where several requirements come from	Most have some traceability to case	Most requirements clearly traceable to case or forum
Concise	Many too long	Many could be shorter	Most concisely written
Unambiguous	Several unclear	Some requirements with some ambiguity	Most requirements clear
Consistent	Many inconsistent with other SRS requirements	A few inconsistencies	All requirements consistent
Avoids Design	Many include design information	A few include design information	No design information
Complete	Many obvious requirements missing	A few obvious requirements missing	Most obvious requirements present
Mark	0	1	3
Total			

Marker Comments/Feedback:

Design information in this case was related to hardware information. See document.

14 / 34

2b: User Stories

Quantity

No user stories	< 5 user stories	5-9 user stories	10+ user stories
0	1	2	3

Style

Does not use template, does not look like user stories	Several problems with template, style	A few problems with template, style	Template used mainly correctly
0	1	2	3

SRS Qualities:

Quality	Poor	OK	Good
Testable	Several not testable	Some stories hard to test	Most stories testable
Estimatable	Several not estimatable	Some stories hard to estimate	Most stories estimatable
Independent	Several stories depend on each other	Some stories depend on each other	Most stories independent
Valuable	Several not valuable, not from case	Some stories not from case	Most stories valuable, from case for forum
Small	Several too long, complicate	Some stories too long or complicated	Most stories small, not too complex
Negotiable	Several stories too detailed, too many constraints	Some stories too detailed, too many constraints	Most stories open and flexible
Avoids Design	Many include design information	A few include design information	No design information
Mark	0	1	3
Total			

Marker Comments/Feedback:

See document.

20 / 27

2c: Requirements Template

Quantity

No requirements in the template	One requirement in the template	Two or more requirements provided in templates
0	1	2

Syntax

Most fields are blank, or contain wrong information	Some fields are blank or contain wrong information	A few issues, missing or wrong fields	All fields filled in, mainly correctly
0	1	2	3

Marker Comments/Feedback:

See document.

3 / 5

2d: Structured Text

Quantity

No requirements in EARS	1-3 requirements in EARS	4+ Requirements in EARS
0	1	2

Syntax

EARS Patterns mainly used incorrectly	Many problems with EARS patterns	A few issues, but mainly correct	Patterns used correctly, only minor issues
0	1	2	3

Identify which patterns used

EARS patterns not identified	Some EARS patterns identified, most correct	EARS patterns identified correctly, only minor issues
------------------------------	---	---

0	1	2
---	---	---

Marker Comments/Feedback:

There are no connection to the requirements and no pattern reference.

2 / 7

2X) Consistency

When user stories capture SRS requirements, SRS and User stories consistent

Very little consistency	Some consistency	Mostly consistent
0	1	3

When templates or structure text captures SRS or User stories, representation is consistent

Very little consistency	Some consistency	Mostly consistent
0	1	3

Textual requirements consistent with models (context, goal, user stories)

Very little consistency	Some consistency	Mostly consistent
0	1	3

Marker Comments/Feedback:

No consistency between EARS and others since there are no connections.

7 / 9

2e: Reflection

Q1: updates

Not answered	Answered, but not clear, missing part, or fairly obvious	Thoughtful clear response answering all of the questions
0	1	2

Q2: difficulties

Not answered	Answered, but not clear, missing part, or fairly obvious	Thoughtful clear response answering all of the questions
--------------	--	--

0	1	2
---	---	---

Q3: benefits and drawbacks

Not answered	Answered, but not clear, missing part, or fairly obvious	Thoughtful clear response answering all of the questions
0	1	2

Style

Answers very hard to read and understand, many errors	Answers understandable, but some issues in clarity, grammar, spelling or punctuation.	Thoughtful clear response answering all of the questions
0	1	2

Marker Comments/Feedback:

No answer provided.

0 / 8