FIT2001: Assignment 2 Assessment Criteria

ASSIGNMENT 2: TOTAL MARKS - 100 (25% of final mark)				
HD **Excellent** Reflects the highest level of performance	**D** **Good** Reflects a mastery of what is required	**C** **Average** Basic understanding of what is required.	**P** **Poor** Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	**N** **Unacceptable** Fails to identify what is required
SYSTEM OVERVIEW (4%)				
Project Description (1)				
• Well thought out, clear and succinct overview of the client's background and rationale for the project. All information needs and problems included.	• Well thought out, clear and succinct overview of the client's background and rationale for the project. Almost all information needs and problems included.	• Demonstrates a basic understanding of client's background and rationale for the project. Most information needs and problems included.	• Demonstrates a basic understanding of client's background and rationale for the project. Many information needs and problems NOT included.	• Has failed to understand the client's background and rationale for the project. Most information needs and problems NOT included.
System Capabilities (2)				
• All functional and non-functional system requirements identified and listed, showing good insight into the system.	• Most functional and non-functional system requirements identified and listed, showing good insight into the system.	• Most functional and some non-functional system requirements identified and listed, showing reasonable insight into the system.	• Some functional and some non-functional system requirements identified and listed, showing some insight into the system.	• Very limited understanding of the functional and non-functional requirements of the system, showing no insight into the system.
Business benefits (1)				
• Benefits presented are relevant and reasonable. All direct and indirect benefits are listed.	• Benefits presented are mostly relevant and reasonable. All direct benefits and most indirect benefits are listed.	• Benefits presented are simple and straightforward. Most direct benefits are listed but there are few or no indirect benefits listed.	• Benefits presented have some relevance to the business problems.	• Benefits not thought through or badly written or no benefits listed.

FIT2001: Assignment 2 Assessment Criteria

HD **Excellent** Reflects the highest level of performance	D **Good** Reflects a mastery of what is required	C **Average** Basic understanding of what is required.	P **Poor** Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	N **Unacceptable** Fails to identify what is required
USER STORY MAPPING (40%)				
USER STORY MAPPING WORKSHOP (12%)				
Workshop Structure & Professionalism (4)				
• Identifiable structure is present. The workshop is conducted in a purposeful, interesting, and effective manner, going through the user story map logically • Language and delivery professional.	• Identifiable structure is present. The workshop is conducted in a purposeful manner, mainly going through the user story map logically • Language and delivery mostly professional.	• Identifiable structure is present. The workshop is conducted in a purposeful manner, with some sense of logical sequencing • Language and delivery mostly professional.	• Identifiable structure is present initially, but is lost and the user story map is not discussed in any sort of logical sequence • Language and delivery not professional.	• Little or no structure present. Workshop is confusing; no logical sequence of ideas; frequently off topic. • Language and delivery not professional.
Workshop Questions (8)				
• Questions comprehensively cover all areas of the clients business and needs. • A lot of variety in type and form of questions. • Always flexible with modifying questions to suit responses by the client	• The majority of questions are relevant to the business. • A lot of variety in type and form of questions. • Mostly flexible with modifying questions to suit responses by the client	• Questions are mostly relevant to the business. • Some variety in type and form of questions. • Sometimes flexible with modifying questions to suit responses by the client	• Few substantive/pertinent questions asked relevant to the business. • Very little variety in type and form of questions. • Very little flexibility with modifying questions to suit responses by the client	• Inappropriate, irrelevant questions asked to illicit responses. • Lacks variety in type and form of questions. • No flexibility – follows agenda regardless of what the client says

FIT2001: Assignment 2 Assessment Criteria

HD **Excellent** Reflects the highest level of performance	D **Good** Reflects a mastery of what is required	C **Average** Basic understanding of what is required.	P **Poor** Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	N **Unacceptable** Fails to identify what is required
DRAFT USER STORY MAP (12%)				
Completeness of requirements gathering (6)				
• The User Story Map and User Stories capture all the business requirements and business rules.	• The User Story Map and User Stories capture almost all the business requirements and business rules.	• The User Story Map and User Stories capture most of the business requirements and business rules.	• Many business requirements and business rules are NOT captured by the User Story Map and User Stories	• Most business requirements and business rules are NOT captured by the User Story Map and User Stories
Quality of User Stories – accurate, consistent, complete, language of the user (3)				
• Very high quality user stories written in the language of the user. • Stories are accurate, consistent and written in the correct style and easy to understand.	• High quality user stories written in the language of the user most of the time. • Stories are mainly accurate, consistent and written in the correct style and easy to understand.	• Reasonable quality user stories written in the language of the user most of the time. • Stories are generally accurate, consistent and written in the correct style and easy to understand.	• User stories often written in an inconsistent and confusing manner, and not easily understood by the user • Stories are often inaccurate and often written in an inconsistent, incorrect style.	• User stories written in an inconsistent, confusing and misleading manner, and cannot be understood by the user. • Stories are mostly inaccurate and written in an inconsistent, incorrect style.
Conditions of satisfaction (Acceptance criteria) (3)				
• All conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are included.	• Nearly all conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are included.	• Most conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are included.	• Many conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are NOT included.	• Most conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are NOT included.

FIT2001: Assignment 2 Assessment Criteria

HD **Excellent** Reflects the highest level of performance	D **Good** Reflects a mastery of what is required	C **Average** Basic understanding of what is required.	P **Poor** Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	N **Unacceptable** Fails to identify what is required
FINAL USER STORY MAP (16%)				
Completeness of requirements gathering (8)				
• The User Story Map and User Stories capture all the business requirements and business rules.	• The User Story Map and User Stories capture almost all the business requirements and business rules.	• The User Story Map and User Stories capture most of the business requirements and business rules.	• Many business requirements and business rules are NOT captured by the User Story Map and User Stories	• Most business requirements and business rules are NOT captured by the User Story Map and User Stories
Quality of User Stories – accurate, consistent, complete, language of the user (4)				
• Very high quality user stories written in the language of the user. • Stories are accurate, consistent and written in the correct style and easy to understand.	• High quality user stories written in the language of the user most of the time. • Stories are mainly accurate, consistent and written in the correct style and easy to understand.	• Reasonable quality user stories written in the language of the user most of the time. • Stories are generally accurate, consistent and written in the correct style and easy to understand.	• User stories often written in an inconsistent and confusing manner, and not easily understood by the user • Stories are often inaccurate and often written in an inconsistent, incorrect style.	• User stories written in an inconsistent, confusing and misleading manner, and cannot be understood by the user. • Stories are mostly inaccurate and written in an inconsistent, incorrect style.
Conditions of satisfaction (Acceptance criteria) (4)				
• All conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are included.	• Nearly all conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are included.	• Most conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are included.	Many conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are NOT included.	• Most conditions of satisfaction (acceptance criteria) are NOT included.

FIT2001: Assignment 2 Assessment Criteria

HD **Excellent** Reflects the highest level of performance	**D** **Good** Reflects a mastery of what is required	**C** **Average** Basic understanding of what is required.	**P** **Poor** Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	**N** **Unacceptable** Fails to identify what is required
ACTIVITY DIAGRAM (15%)				
Activity Diagram – captures requirements (12)				
• The Activity diagram accurately and comprehensively represents the specified function, with clear and correct identification of inputs, outputs and decisions.	• The Activity diagram in nearly all instances accurately and comprehensively represents the specified function.	• The Activity diagram in most instances comprehensively represents the specified function, but there are some inaccuracies in the representation.	• The Activity diagram does NOT comprehensively represent the specified function, and there are many inaccuracies in the representation.	• The Activity diagram provides a very limited representation of specified system functionality, and there are many inaccuracies in the representation.
Modelling technique & Standards (3)				
• The Activity diagram conforms to a modelling standard and the team's own standards. • Model is consistent and uses the correct notation (including swim lanes). • Model has a clear layout and efficient construction. • Shows a very strong grasp of the technique.	• The Activity diagram conforms mostly to a modelling standard. • Model is mostly internally consistent. • Model has a clear layout • Shows a good grasp of the technique.	• Does not entirely conform to accepted modelling standards but is close. • Model lacks some internal consistency. • Model mostly has a clear layout • Shows understanding of the technique.	• The Activity Diagram does not conform very well to modelling standards. • Model lacks internal consistency. • Model has a confusing layout in most instances • Shows a lack of understanding of the technique.	• The Activity Diagram does not conform to any modelling standards. • No attempts made at internal consistency in model. • Model is very poorly laid out • Shows no grasp of the technique.

FIT2001: Assignment 2 Assessment Criteria

HD **Excellent** Reflects the highest level of performance	D **Good** Reflects a mastery of what is required	C **Average** Basic understanding of what is required.	P **Poor** Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	N **Unacceptable** Fails to identify what is required
USE CASE DIAGRAM (15%)				
Supports required business functionality (12)				
• The Use Case Diagram(s) are well-evolved and accurately and comprehensively represent the required business functionality. • Has identified all reusable functionality – shows an excellent understanding of <<includes>> associations. • Has identified all optional functionality – shows an excellent understanding of <<extends>> associations.	• The Use Case Diagram(s) in nearly all instances accurately and comprehensively represent the required business functionality • Has identified nearly all reusable functionality – shows a good understanding of <<includes>> associations. • Has identified nearly all optional functionality – shows a good understanding of <<extends>> associations.	• The Use Case Diagram(s) in most instances comprehensively represent the required business functionality, but there are some inaccuracies in the representation. • Has identified most reusable functionality – shows a reasonable understanding of <<includes>> associations. • Has identified most optional functionality – shows a reasonable understanding of <<extends>> associations.	• The Use Case Diagram(s) do NOT comprehensively represent the required business functionality, and there are many inaccuracies in the representation. • Has identified some reusable functionality – shows a very basic understanding of <<includes>> associations. • Has identified some optional functionality – shows a very basic understanding of <<extends>> associations.	• The Use Case Diagram(s) provide a very limited representation of the required business functionality, and there are many inaccuracies. • Has identified no reusable functionality – shows no understanding of <<includes>> associations. • Has identified no optional functionality – shows no understanding of <<extends>> associations.
Modelling technique & Standards (3)				
• Use Case diagrams are well presented and conform to a modelling standard and the team's own standards. • Models are internally consistent. • Notation used correctly - shows a very strong grasp of the technique.	• Use Case diagrams are mostly well presented and conform mostly to a modelling standard. • Models are mostly internally consistent. • Notation mostly used correctly - shows a good grasp of the technique.	• Use Case diagrams could be better presented and need a bit more precision and accuracy. • Do not entirely conform to accepted modelling standards but are close. • Models lack some internal consistency. • Notation used correctly in places but there are errors - shows a basic understanding of the technique.	• Use Case Diagrams are not well presented and do not conform very well to any modelling standards. • Models lack internal consistency. • Notation NOT used correctly - shows a lack of understanding of the technique.	• Use Case Diagrams do not conform to any modelling standards. • No attempts made at internal consistency in models. • Notation completely incorrect - shows no grasp of the technique.

FIT2001: Assignment 2 Assessment Criteria

HD **Excellent** Reflects the highest level of performance	D **Good** Reflects a mastery of what is required	C **Average** Basic understanding of what is required.	P **Poor** Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required	N **Unacceptable** Fails to identify what is required
DOMAIN MODEL CLASS DIAGRAM (22%)				
Supports required business functionality (19)				
• All the classes and relationships accurately and efficiently reflect the information needs and logical requirements of the business. • All attributes are identified for the data needs of the business. • All multiplicities and relationships are realistic and address the business needs.	• Nearly all the classes and relationships accurately and efficiently reflect the information needs and logical requirements of the business. • Nearly all attributes are identified for the data needs of the business. • Nearly all multiplicities and relationships are realistic and address the business needs.	• Most of the classes and relationships accurately and efficiently reflect the information needs and logical requirements of the business. • Most attributes are identified for the data needs of the business. • Most multiplicities and relationships are realistic and address the business needs.	• Some of the classes and relationships accurately and efficiently reflect the information needs and logical requirements of the business. • Some attributes are identified for the data needs of the business. • Some multiplicities and relationships are realistic and address the business needs.	• Almost none of the classes and relationships accurately and efficiently reflect the information needs and logical requirements of the business. • Almost none of the attributes are identified for the data needs of the business. • Almost not of the multiplicities and relationships are realistic and address the business needs.
Modelling technique & Standards (3)				
• The Domain class diagram conforms to the modelling standard and the team's own standards. • Model is internally consistent. • Shows a very strong grasp of the technique. • Diagram layout strongly assists communication. • Clear, intuitive and unambiguous naming of classes, attributes in all instances.	• The Domain model class diagram conforms mostly to a modelling standard. • Model is mostly internally consistent. • Shows a good grasp of the technique. • Diagram layout mostly assists communication. • Clear, unambiguous naming of classes, attributes in most instances.	• The Domain model class diagram does not entirely conform to accepted modelling standards but is close. • Model lacks some internal consistency. • Diagram layout generally assists communication, but some layout aspects quite confusing. • Naming of classes, attributes in quite a few instances lack clarity and are ambiguous.	• The Domain model class diagram does not conform very well to modelling standards. • Model lacks internal consistency. • Diagram layout generally confusing and hinders communication. • Naming of classes, attributes in many instances lack clarity and are ambiguous.	• The Domain model class diagram does not conform to any modelling standards. • No attempts made at internal consistency in model/ • Shows no grasp of the technique. • Diagram layout totally confusing and hinders communication. • Naming of classes, attributes in most instances lack clarity and are ambiguous.

REPORT PRESENTATION AND TEAM ASSIGNMENT PROJECT MANAGEMENT (4%)

- Title page, Table of Contents, Page numbers etc.
- Well formatted – headings, sub-headings are consistent etc.
- Trello board – Completed tasks reflected on Trello board, including deadlines, team member tasks allocations etc.

CATME – Self and Peer Assessment

Each student will rate their own performance and that of their team members for Assignment 2 across the following 5 key areas of team: Contributing to the team's work, Interacting with teammates, Keeping the team on track, Expecting quality and Having relevant knowledge, skills and abilities.

Each team member's rating will be used to scale the team assignment mark, to calculate the team member's individual mark.
The team assignment mark can be scaled up by up to 10% (or the maximum mark available for the assignment), or can be scaled down to 0 marks for the assignment – there is no percentage limit to scaling down.

Please ensure that you include comments explaining your decision, if you have rated a team member lower than the rest of the team.