

# FIT5136 Assignment 1 Marking Rubric

	Actual Weight (%)	N (0-4.9)	P (5 - 5.9)	C (6 - 6.9)	D (7 - 7.9)	HD (8 - 10)
		<b>Unacceptable</b> Fails to identify what is required	<b>Basic</b> Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	<b>Expected</b> Basic understanding and delivery of what is required.	<b>Good</b> Reflects a mastery of what is required	<b>Excellent</b> Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required
<b>USER STORIES AND THEIR ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA</b>						
1.1 User Stories	25%	- Failed to attempt user stories Or - Shows no understanding of requirements - Only contains a description of processes of the software - unacceptable structure followed - ambiguous user story - frequent use of technical keywords to define the features	- Some mistakes with the prescribed syntax - Shows little understanding of requirements - User stories are somewhat meaningful that shows little understanding of the project - Most of the user stories do not comply all the INVEST principles	- A few mistakes with the prescribed syntax - Shows some understanding of requirements - User stories are meaningful that shows some understanding of the project - Some of the user stories comply with INVEST principles	- User stories are mostly following the prescribed syntax - User stories shows a detailed understanding of the structure, requirements and the project - Most of the user stories comply with INVEST principles	- User stories are created by following the prescribed structure - User stories are accurate, logical and written adhering to INVEST principles. - User stories shows a knowledgeable and clear understanding of the requirements.
1.2 Acceptance Criteria	25%	- Failed to attempt the acceptance criteria Or - Acceptance criteria is not aligned with what the user story says - Unacceptable structure followed - Vague acceptance criteria - Frequent use of technical keywords to define the flow of the events of the user story	- Acceptance criteria are aligned only for a few of their user stories - Structure followed has mistakes to improve - Most of the acceptance criteria are unrealistic which is somewhat hard to follow and develop - Some use of technical keywords to define the flow of the events of the user stories	- Acceptance criteria are aligned for some of their user stories. - Structure followed is close to the expectation - Some of the acceptance criteria is clear, easy-to-follow but lack in realism and/or being achievable. - A few technical keywords used to define the flow of the events of the user stories	- Acceptance criteria are aligned for most of their user stories with minor mistakes - Structured followed is self-explanatory - Most of the acceptance criteria shows a complete and thorough understanding of the user story and user's need, and has step-by-step, realistic and achievable acceptance criteria - Some acceptance have not included the non-functional requirements as set by the client	- All the acceptance criteria are aligned with their user story with negligible minor mistakes - Structure followed is self-explanatory and very structured - For each user story, acceptance criteria shows a complete and thorough understanding of the user story and user's need, and has clear-to-follow step-by-step, realistic and achievable acceptance criteria from start to finish with minimal mistakes. - Acceptance criteria has functional as well as non-functional requirements included (where required).
<b>PROTOTYPE</b>						
2.1 User Experience	15%	- Flow between the screens is absolutely confusing or no navigation - No use of styling - No consideration of design of the application as per one of the usability design principles	- Have some basic flow but majority of the flow and user experience is confusing - Cannot demonstrate the main event flow - Minimal use of one of the usability design principles - Have little use of the styling towards the application, followed some old program UI design principles that is considered outdated (e.g skeuomorphism)	-Have some basic flow but some of the flow and user experience is confusing -Partially demonstrate the basic main event flow -Some use of the usability design principles -Have some basic use of the styling towards the application, follow some old program UI design principles that is considered somewhat outdated (e.g some uses of the skeuomorphism with some modern design principles)	- Have good flow, a few of the flow and user experience is confusing -Demonstrate majority of the main event flow - One of the usability design principles used with some scope of improvement - Have good use of the styling towards the application, design style indicate some relevance to the latest UI design principle	-Have excellent flow, no confusion -Demonstrate all main event flow -Excellent evidence of using one of the usability design principles, however, a few improvements can be recommended -Have excellent styling towards the application, please to the eye, design style indicate relevance to the latest UI design principle
2.2 UI Content	10%	Data or options shown in the prototype are not relevant to the project	Some basic sample data with understandable menu options	Fair sample data with understandable menu options	- Good sample data with good and easy to understand menu options	- Excellent sample data with no confusion of menu options - Excellent placement of the content with no cluttering and maintain minimalism
2.3 Client requirement	15%	The team designed prototype based on their own requirements	The team designed a few parts of the prototype in accordance with client requirements.	The team designed some parts of the prototype in accordance with client requirements.	The team designed majority of the parts of the prototype in accordance with client requirements.	The team designed the prototype in accordance with client requirements.
<b>PROTOTYPE PRESENTATION</b>						
2.4 Organisation (team) and Visual Aids	10%	-Organisation of presentation does not assist understanding and contains major mistakes or inconsistency -Presenter(s) had no rehearsal -Demonstrate no evidence of collaboration, preparation and practice - No use of visual aid to assist in delivering the message, standards used including images, animations where applicable	-Organisation of presentation somewhat assists understanding, and contains quite a number of mistakes or inconsistency -Presenter(s) had no rehearsal -Demonstrate basic evidence of collaboration, preparation and practice -Almost no use of visual aid to assist in delivering the message, standards used including images, animations where applicable	-Organisation of presentation assist understanding as per the expectation with some mistakes or inconsistency -Presenter(s) had lack of rehearsal -Demonstrate some evidence of collaboration, preparation and practice -Basic use of visual aid to assist in delivering the message, standards used including images, animations where applicable	-Good Organisation of presentation to assist understanding and no mistakes -Presenter(s) shows proper evidence of rehearsal -Demonstrate good evidence of collaboration, preparation and practice -Good and sensible use of visual aid to assist in delivering the message, standards used including images, animations where applicable	-Excellent organisation of presentation to assist understanding and no to minimal mistakes -Well presented -Demonstrate excellent evidence of collaboration, preparation and practice -Excellent and sensible use of visual aid to assist in delivering the message, standards used including images, animations where applicable