

# Team Project 2022-23

## S2 Ranking Criteria - guidelines

February 2023

### General guidance

#### Why do we need these guidelines?

In Milestone 2 the team will decide the ranking of individual work within the team submitted in individual Submission 2. The team will be able to report non-contributions or low-contributions, and we will investigate these. The team will decide the ranking criteria and this document gives some guidance of what is acceptable and not.

#### Effect on grade

In M2 the team will be required to submit:

A rank of individual Submissions for S2. For each member of the team you should include up to 100 words on the criteria and feedback that led to the ranking. Put any non-submissions or too-low-contribution as N/A. Equal ranks are not allowed. Individual grades will not be affected by the ranking unless the no-submissions or too-low-contribution.

**Assessed on: ranking criteria/feedback used to rank, fairness and consistency.**

### Plagiarism and professional issues

As usual, S2 must be your own work, you cannot submit any work done by any other team member. Plagiarism can be reported to the module leader or anonymously to welfare and will be dealt via University policy.

### Sharing work

After submission, you must share your individual work with your team. You can upload your work to the 'Files' section of your team on Canvas, or use any other University service (e.g. OneDrive, git), so your team has access to everyone's contribution. You can share the source files/documents used to create your submission the same way.

### Contribution and professional issues

Individual contribution to team work affects everyone in your team. Not submitting to Submission 2 (without a welfare referral) will result in a referral directly to the School Head of Education. This can result in a formal letter and invitation to a meeting.

# 1 Ranking guide

These lists are only a guideline for the ranking system teams can use for S2. **The team must decide and agree the criteria together.** The team might assign a different importance to the criteria, or have a different breakdown within these criteria. It is important to develop and apply whatever criteria the team decide fairly.

## Agile Estimation of Cards

1. Units:
  - follows an agreed unit
  - similar enough to the agreed unit
  - different to the agreed unit
2. Reasonable estimation:
  - reasonable relative to other estimations
  - high/low relative to other estimation
  - estimation unreasonable: too large/too small
3. Subject of Kanban cards:
  - clear references to persona, feature and mockups
  - some indirect link to project elements
  - unclear link to app elements
4. Practicalities in Kanban estimation:
  - uploaded in the agreed format/boards/cards
  - not in the agreed format/boards

## Tech Report

1. Format:
  - follows an agreed format/layout
  - similar enough to the agreed format
  - different to the agreed format
2. Specific to project:
  - links clearly and well to the team's project
  - report fits well within the project
  - unclear link to the project
3. Agreed topic:
  - report on agreed topic
  - different topic than agreed
4. Independent work:
  - report clearly developed independently
  - mostly developed independently
  - relies heavily on found information
5. Within page limit:
  - one page report
  - more or less than a page
  - well over or well under the limit
6. Benefit of report:
  - very useful: excellent analysis, relevant to to project, reduces research and development time for whole team
  - somewhat useful: relevant to only some of the team or some development work
  - not useful or generic information
7. Contribution to quality:
  - provides clear guidelines on quality of code contributions
  - some relevant quality of code contributions
  - not useful information on quality contribution

8. Justification of tech stack move/changes:

- meets or is possible to meet all requirements of “Choosing a different tech stack”<sup>1</sup>
- meets most requirements for “Choosing a different tech stack”
- meets only some requirements for “Choosing a different tech stack”
- does not meet requirements for “Choosing a different tech stack”

## Tech stack/CI

1. Usefulness of the contribution to MVP:

- Excellent, useful contribution to MVP
- Basic, generic contribution to MVP
- No contribution to MVP

2. Commits messages:

- Useful and clear commit messages
- Unclear or generic commit message
- Blank commit messages

3. Commits Practicalities:

- Evidence of commit to correct repo/agreed file(s), using SSH
- Not in the agreed format/repo/file

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://canvas.bham.ac.uk/courses/65777/discussion\\_topics/954689](https://canvas.bham.ac.uk/courses/65777/discussion_topics/954689)