Each assignment is graded over a series of categories. You will be judged on a scale of 1-4 for each criterion, where a 1 corresponds to a 60%, a 2 corresponds to 75%, a 3 corresponds to 90%, and a 4 corresponds to 100%. If there is no work for a criterion or it is clear that even a minimal amount of effort was not put in, you will receive a 0% for that section of the assignment.

The following is a tentative grading rubric for Assignment 2. This may change before final grading, but gives criteria to aim for with your submission.

**Peer Evaluation (5%):**

Present or not.

**Organization (5%):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4** | Have a good organization including a logical layout, requirements grouped by similarity, all sections present, requirements formatted to be easily understood, uses good grammar, and has a single voice. No irrelevant data (i.e., made up “satisfaction numbers”). |
| **3** | Most sections present, layout mostly logical, and requirements are easily understood. Lacks single voice and has some grammar issues. |
| **2** | Missing some sections, illogical layout, and requirements are hard to understand. Lacks a single voice, many grammar issues |
| **1** | Missing major sections, layout illogical, and requirements are not readable. Hard to read and understand. |

**Use Cases (30%):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4** | Captures core usage scenarios of BILL system. Present and well formatted diagram. Descriptions are clear. System boundary and actors are clear and correct both in diagram and document. |
| **3** | Some mistakes in UC diagram or descriptions. Missing system boundary descriptions or actors incorrect. Internal activities discussed in description. |
| **2** | UC is unclear and incorrect in several areas. |
| **1** | UC mostly incorrect - for example, specified a GUI without underlying data processing system. |

**Requirements (30%):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4** | All major system functionality captured. Accounts for error cases. Requirements sufficiently complete and detailed enough to implement. Requirements are not contradictory. |
| **3** | Most system functionality captured, or error cases are not accounted for. Lacking in detail. |
| **2** | Missing some major functionality including, missing error cases, or incorrect descriptions of functionality (not up to date with elicitation). Requirements barely detailed, are ambiguous, or are contradictory. |
| **1** | Missing most functionality. Generally unable to determine what system is supposed to do. Lack of detail sufficient to be unable to implement software. |

**Tests (30%):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4** | Major system functionality tested (correct and incorrect input tested), traceability matrix  present, test I/O sufficiently detailed, success/failure conditions well-defined, pre/post conditions well-defined. |
| **3** | Major system functionality tested (only one condition tested), traceability matrix present, test I/O sufficiently detailed, success/failure conditions and pre/post conditions incorrect or not clearly defined. |
| **2** | Missing some functionality tests, traceability matrix present, tests poorly defined. |
| **1** | Missing major functionality tests, traceability matrix present, tests poorly defined. |

(Traceability matrix missing drops you down 1 level.)