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**I. Backlog sketch**

1. Leave feedback
2. anonymity
   1. encrypt user data in system
3. pattern of surveys
   1. create common list of questions for creating new survey
4. prevent multiple voting
   1. store anonymous tokens of users that voted in survey
5. View feedback
   1. different access rights
      1. students can only view their left feedbacks
      2. TA’s can view feedback only about themselves
      3. professor can only view feedback about him/herself and his/her TA’s
      4. DoE can view detailed feedback about everyone
   2. view detailed report on one person
      1. charts (e.g. average rating over time)
      2. statistics (average, median, distribution, number of votes, num of written feedback, etc.)
   3. view cross-report on several people
      1. make a rating
      2. make charts of one of statistics over time

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Epics** | **Features** | **Functionals** |
| Leave feedback | Anonymity | Encrypt user data in system |
| Pattern of surveys | Create common list of questions for creating new survey |
| Prevent multiple voting | Store anonymous tokens of users that voted in survey |
| View feedback | Different access rights | Students can only view their left feedbacks |
| TA’s can view feedback only about themselves |
| Professor can only view feedback about him/herself and his/her TA’s |
| DoE can view detailed feedback about everyone |
| View detailed report on one person | Charts (e.g. average rating over time) |
| Statistics (average, median, distribution, number of votes, num of written feedback, etc.) |
| View cross-report on several people | Make a rating |
| Make charts of one of statistics over time |

**II. User stories for our epics, features and functionals**

1. As a student I want to leave the feedback on the course, lecture and lab.
2. As a student I want an anonymity for all the feedback I left so that no one can figure out what feedback I left.
3. As a DoE representative, I want to create feedback form templates so that I can use them in future to create similar forms.
4. As a professor I want to view the feedback on my courses, lectures and labs.
5. As a DoE representative, I want to be sure that no student leaves feedback on a professor or TA more than once.
6. As a TA I want to view the feedback on labs I am assigned to.
7. As a DoE representative, I want system to create report with statistics for specified time period, so that I can save time not doing this manually.

**III. INVEST table with our criteria of estimation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Independent** | How much this user story is connected to others | 0 - does not depend on, or is loosely/indirectly interconnected with other items  1 - has dependent stories  2 - depends on other stories  3 - depends on other stories and has dependent stories |
| **Negotiable** | Is there any room for further conversation with stakeholder about the details of the feature | True- Negotiable  False - User story provides all the details required for implementation |
| **Valuable** | How important is the feature to the customer or user | 0 - valuable for both  1 - important to user  2 - desired by customer only  3 - holds no value for both |
| **Estimable** | Is it easy to predict resources spent on developing this feature | 0 - Easy to estimate (we know the actual time spent on feature)  1 - Further actions need to be done to estimate  2 - Hard to prognosticate |
| **Size appropriate** | Is one sprint enough to accomplish development of this features | True - Can be implemented in one sprint  False - Cannot be implemented in one sprint |
| **Testable** | Do user story have clear acceptance criteria? | 0 - Have clear AC that can be automatically performed on deployment  1 - Have clear AC, but have to be accepted/tested manually  2 - It is not clear whether story is satisfied |

**IV. INVEST assessment of our user stories**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Story** | **I** | **N** | **V** | **E** | **S** | **T** |
| **1** | 1 | F | 0 | 0 | T | 0 |
| **2** | 0 | F | 0 | 2 | F | 0 |
| **3** | 2 | T | 0 | 1 | F | 0 |
| **4** | 2 | T | 0 | 0 | T | 0 |
| **5** | 0 | T | 0 | 0 | T | 1 |
| **6** | 2 | F | 0 | 1 | T | 0 |
| **7** | 2 | T | 0 | 1 | F | 1 |

1. Independent (1): this user story has dependent stories (feedback left by the student is going to be viewed by professor, DoE or TA)

Negotiable (F): user story provides all the needed details on the issue

Valuable (0): it is valuable for both since it is one of the key user stories in the project

Estimable (0): the story does not require much resources

Size appropriate (T): it seems like it could be done in one sprint

Testable (0): it is easy to test whether the system can store the feedback from the students or not

2. Independent (0): It is independent as implementation of the encryption algorithms does not depend on other features

Negotiable (F): User story provides all the details required for implementation

Valuable (0): important both for user to be confident in his anonymity and for DoE for involving new students into feedback system.

Estimable (2): Hard to estimate how to create reliable encryption for our system

Size appropriate (F): Cannot be done in one sprint

Testable (0): We can test it by well-known criterias for hashing algorithm

3. Independent (2): this story clearly depends on other stories (students providing feedback)

Negotiable (T): some aspects can be changed

Valuable (0): important for both sides of the project

Estimable (1): need to make some further actions for understanding the workload

Size appropriate (F): connected to the previous criteria

Testable (0): there are plenty of decent methods for testing such a feature - creating feedback forms using the templates is one of them. If a form is created according to template, it is done

4. Independent (2): this user story depends on story 1

Negotiable (T): some details of development still can be clarified

Valuable (0): without this feature system is not considered to be complete, because it’s the main feature for professor

Estimable (0): the whole features is just simple retrieval of data; our team estimated implementation to take no longer than couple of days

Size appropriate (T): see explanation for ‘Estimable’; can be done within a time of one sprints

Testable (0): there is an objective mechanism that allows us to test the correctness of implementation - simple query with rights of professor will work

7. Independent (2): this user story depends on several stories (feedback should be left and then accessed to provide statistics)

Negotiable (T): all design decisions are up to us, and the data has to be displayed can be discussed

Valuable (0): this user story is one of the most crucial for our system

Estimable (1): for now we are not sure which frontend framework will we use and how easy it will be to implement this statistics

Size appropriate (F): story is too big for one sprint

Testable (1): we will have to manually check if all graphs are correct and visible, but this is easy enough.