| Criteria | HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required | D<br>Good<br>Reflects a mastery<br>of what is required | C Expected Obvious Understanding and delivery of what is required | P Basic Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required | N<br>Unacceptable<br>Fails to identify<br>what is required |
|----------|---|--|---|---|--|
|----------|---|--|---|---|--|

|   | Please note that all feedback has already been given to you, via your review in your studios.  |                    |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Highlight the cell where the team sits                | Advanced Evidence of Exceeding Standards Comments  |                    | Concerns Areas that Need Work Comments |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis and Design re                                | port - Already reviewed as part  | of Business Vision |  |  |  |  |  |
| Changes from<br>Presentation<br>Feedback<br>on report | Changes from Presentation Presentation Feedback  Simple but appropriate and meaningful list of changes to requirements that came up at the presentation. These are added to the report after the presentation and before the report is sent to the clients and also filed in the PGP. They can also be minuted and sent to the client. |                    |  |  |  |  |  |

| TRELLO  |  | Reviewed every studio Ongoing  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Trello containing User stories These will change as the iteration proceeds, backlog ideas in backlog with priorities Waiting lane top priority broken |  | High level user stories match report Proficient analysis/ critical evaluation of what is required required in determining the successful implementation of each component  Broken down user stories matches high level user stories/functions  AND Minor errors to user stories / written unclearly. Descriptions appropriate and precise. |  |

| Criteria   | HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required | D<br>Good<br>Reflects a mastery<br>of what is required | C Expected Obvious Understanding and delivery of what is required   | P Basic Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required | N<br>Unacceptable<br>Fails to identify<br>what is required |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| down to do lane acceptance criteria added added Done lane user stories BUILT and tested.                         | t t   |  | AND Acceptance criteria has been written well but not specific enough, or missing some parts.   |   |  |
| Format/ Updates<br>Of TRELLO   |   |  | Format is at a usable for attended audience AND Frequently updated by some team members AND Demonstrates a proficient understanding of how to use this tool to manage the team and project. |   |  |
| Acceptance Te  | esting Document   |  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |   |  |
| max 1-3 pages<br>Should not have<br>acceptance criteria  |   |  | Matches above AND NO acceptance criteria BUT has maybe hasn't thought about client workflow to aid acceptance testing   |   |  |
| Details for inte   | grity Testing   |  |   |   |  |
| Has latest version of<br>system (URL), in client<br>or mentor folder<br>Instructions only<br>needed if necessary | t   |  | Includes each persona that will use the system AND Has logins and passwords (if required)  AND Concise clear instructions to review the system, if needed  And is correct                   |   |  |

| Criteria   | HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required        | D<br>Good<br>Reflects a mastery<br>of what is required | C Expected Obvious Understanding and delivery of what is required   | P Basic Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required   | N<br>Unacceptable<br>Fails to identify<br>what is required  |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| BUILD  |  |  |   |   |   |
| Use/ Security a  | and Maintainabil   | lity   |   |   |   |
| Use - Quality/<br>working/User journey<br>Security   | level of performance,<br>beyond what is<br>required<br>needs no<br>improvement, can be | required needs some                                    | Obvious understanding and delivery of what is required Could be released, could be used as is, but could be improved - Considered aspects                               | Reflects the beginnings of understanding what's required Couldn't be released, but is close it doesn't crash and is what was asked for but could be improved understand that it is necessary but nothing taken into account | Fails to identify what is required crashes/ not what was promised to the client have not thought about it |
| see here for De  | etails to check ag   | gainst Use and Sec                                     | curity  |   |   |
| **Build Quality: Things to achieve  Easy to use/ Layout is clear and intuitive; one can always find what they need  It is easy to navigate through the information to find necessary features  Layout is consistent and logical on all pages  No unnecessary features such as customer id, if not needed  Date format appropriate  Colours/fonts/ text layout Appropriate;  All links work properly or appropriately.  Pages work in most browsers (including mobile).  Messages displayed and appropriate  Everything accurate and comprehensive and clearly focused, organised and logical |  |  | **Working Program: Produces correct results. Does not crash Allow valid input Disallow invalid input  Contain broken links Fails to display required information, etc., | ***User Journey  Small details at each journey are carefully appropriate.  Spelling, grammar, in placement, consister thought out and apprecate of the conforms to accepte standards  | thought out and<br>nagery, layout, button<br>ncy, etc are all well<br>opriate                             |
|  |  |  | available to other users, are passwords hashed appropriately, are secr<br>ble to injection attacks  | et documents publicly acces   | sible, are users able t   |

| required understanding what is required understanding what is |  | Criteria | HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required | D<br>Good<br>Reflects a mastery<br>of what is required | C<br>Expected<br>Obvious Understanding and delivery of what is required |  | N<br>Unacceptable<br>Fails to identify<br>what is required |
|---|--|----------|---|--|---|--|--|
|---|--|----------|---|--|---|--|--|

| Maintainability  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Readability - The code is  | The code is fairly easy to read.   |  |
| Reusability  | Most of the code could be reused in other programs.  |  |
| Documentation is   | The documentation consists of embedded comment and some simple header documentation that is somewhat useful in understanding the code.           |  |
| Efficiency   | The code is efficient and understandable but could be better structured.  Architecture  Easy to understand, plugins used meaningfully documented |  |
| Architecture   |  |  |
| Retrospective Artifact   |  |  |
| A reflection on processes What went well, what didn't go well, and how can we improve? | Planned and thought about adequately AND Understanding changes needed accurate and comprehensive and clearly focused, easy to understand         |  |
| max 1 page   | AND Mostly referring to changes in processes   |  |
|  | AND Shows understanding of reasons for retrospectives  |  |

| Criteria | HD   | D   | С   | Р   | N   |
|----------|--|---|---|---|---|
|          | Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required | Good<br>Reflects a mastery<br>of what is required | Expected Obvious Understanding and delivery of what is required | Basic Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required | Unacceptable Fails to identify what is required |

| Client acceptan   | Client acceptance testing report with feedback |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Matches high level but meaningful functional requirements needed for this iteration should not have acceptance criteria |  | Mostly Matches testing report in iteration report and reasons for differences are acceptable  BUT Has NOT thought about client workflow to aid acceptance testing.  AND Has adequate front pages and sign off facility  AND Was explained to the clients face to face. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P.I.R   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | Most aspects accurate and defined and clearly AND client as audience in mind is obvious  AND Almost succinct, but with some waffle, 2 -3 pages  AND Actions to solve any issues  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| PGP<br>Reviewed Every<br>Studio<br>Ongoing | Up To Date, items in correct folders, critically considered how it will be used and designed for that   | Up To Date, items in correct folders, meaningful Understanding obvious of how it will be used | folders, meaningful<br>and usable        | items not in correct folders, but still usable. Team has some | Not up To Date,<br>items not in correct folders,<br>Shows no understando f<br>purpose |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Testing details:                           | Records/Documents clear and comp<br>Processes used to test iterations,<br>(people, types of testing, any softwa<br>Test cases - samples given to show | ·   | should relate to acceptance criteria, or | n user stories.   |   |

| Criteria   | HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required   | D<br>Good<br>Reflects a mastery<br>of what is required  |  | C<br>Expected<br>Obvious Understanding and delivery of wh  | at is required              | P Basic Reflects the beginnings of understanding what is required | N<br>Unacceptable<br>Fails to identify<br>what is required |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
|  |   |   |  |  |                             |   |  |  |
| Maintenance/<br>System/<br>Techdoc:  | Records/ Documents clear and May include (and only if used): System Architecture (Architectu Technologies used/Technical sports Updated use cases ( | System Architecture (Architecture of technology use), may be diagrams/lists of modules used, system activity diagrams, ER conceptual diagrams  echnologies used/Technical specification  Updated use cases (if used, due to changes in functionality requested by client from original use cases) |  |  |                             |   |  |  |
|  | Working updated det     Any scripts etc with - Well label   |   |  | •  | irther analysis) and so on. |   |  |  |
| Client<br>interactions<br>Includes,minutes,<br>Agendas, emails,<br>notes,<br>presentations   |   |   |  | appropriate, useful and usable<br>And up to date,<br>Some thought gone into<br>organisation for later use by client  |                             |   |  |  |
| Dev artefacta .e.g user story mapping, flowcharts, process//activity diagrams,Interfac e mock-ups, rough sketches, user journeys mind maps etc.  Photos of drawings are fine |   |   |  | Up to date, obviously used, not made up for mentors' benefit  Have a good idea of how to use of artifacts to achieve results  Possible to see how the team moved from their data and information collection to their understanding of what was needed. |                             |   |  |  |
| Feedback from mentors  |   |   |  | All feedback noted, meaningful and well- organised organise  |                             |   |  |  |

| Criteria | HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is | D<br>Good<br>Reflects a mastery | C Expected Obvious Understanding and delivery of what is required | P Basic Reflects the                               | N<br>Unacceptable<br>Fails to identify |
|----------|--|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
|          | required   | of what is required             |   | beginnings of<br>understanding what is<br>required | what is required                       |