Iteration 1 Special for FIT 3048 (report and presentation in Business Vision)

Report (for mentor use and client use after the presentation) and Client presentation part of Business Vision and already reviewed

a. Overview of users for this iteration - personas
(copied from Business Vision, unless new)

b. Current Iteration Overview (high level)
Defining value that the client will gain

c. (link to Trello on report)

containing User stories   **Ongoing Iteration 1 priorities labelled on Trello Board.**

d. High level timeline
Not much detail beyond tasks such as analysis of needs weekly meetings))testing/acceptance date, delivery date, next it. iteration

Criteria	HD **Excellent** Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required	D **Good** Reflects a mastery 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 **Unacceptable** Fails to identify what is required
Changes from Presentation Feedback on report	**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.**				

Special 3048 Iteration 1 UG IE Assessment Criteria Rubric - S2 2022 Version 1

Criteria	HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required	D Good Reflects a mastery 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 Unacceptable Fails to identify what is required
TRELLO					
Trello containing User stories These will change as the iteration proceeds, **backlog** ideas in backlog with priorities **Waiting lane** top priority broken down **to do lane** acceptance criteria added added **Done lane** user stories BUILT and tested. **Reviewed every studio** **Ongoing**	High level user stories match report Shows exceptional analysis and evaluation of what is required in determining the successful implementation Broken down user stories matches high level user stories/functions AND Stories broken down ready for building written clearly. Descriptions appropriate and precise. AND Acceptance criteria (worked out with client and team) written well, specific and complete	High level user stories match report Shows superior analysis and evaluation of what is required in determining the successful implementation of each component Broken down user stories matches high level user stories/functions AND Stories broken down ready for building, descriptions appropriate and precise AND Acceptance criteria (worked out with client and team) written well, specific and complete	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. AND Acceptance criteria has been written well but not specific enough, or missing some parts.	High level user stories match report Satisfactory analysis of what is required. Shows very little (but some) thought of what is required in determining the successful implementation of each component Broken down user stories mostly matches high level user stories/functions OR User stories / written unclearly. Descriptions are appropriate and not precise. OR Acceptance criteria are a little inaccurate and non-comprehensive.	High level user stories do not match report Low level of analysis completed to determine what required. Shows no understanding of requirements OR Descriptions are completely inappropriate for requirements. Entries are incomplete or vague, OR acceptance criteria are not sufficient / not notated / or are vague, does not exist or is unusable by mentors
Format/ Updates Of TRELLO	Format is easy to use for intended audience (team & mentors) AND Kept up to date by all members at all times AND Demonstrates an exceptional understanding of how to use this tool to manage the team and project	Format is easy to use for intended audience (Team & mentors) AND Kept up to date by most team members AND Demonstrates a superior understanding of how to use this tool to manage the team and project.	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.	Format is slightly unclear, and not easy to use OR Not kept up to date as often updated by all team members OR Demonstrates some understanding of how to use this tool to manage the team and project.	Poor formatting and mostly unclear entries OR Not used or not kept up to date by any team members (updated only at point of iteration submission) OR Does not demonstrate any understanding of how to use this tool.

Special 3048 Iteration 1 UG IE Assessment Criteria Rubric - S2 2022 Version 1

Criteria	HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required	D Good Reflects a mastery 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 Unacceptable Fails to identify what is required
Acceptance Testing Document					
max 1-3 pages Should not have acceptance criteria	Matches above AND NO acceptance criteria AND has considered critically client workflow to aid acceptance testing, when they do it in the future, diagrams to help	Mostly matches above AND NO acceptance criteria AND and has thought about client workflow to aid acceptance testing.	Matches above AND NO acceptance criteria BUT has maybe hasn't thought about client workflow to aid acceptance testing	Does not match above But is close, OR Has some basic acceptance criteria	Does not match above OR Has extensive acceptance criteria
Details for integrity testing					
Has latest version of system (URL), in client or mentor folder 1 page max. Instructions only needed if necessary	Includes each persona that will use the system AND Has logins and passwords AND Concise clear instructions to review the system (however, system should be intuitive **And is correct**	Includes each persona that will use the system AND Has logins and passwords AND Concise clear instructions to review the system (however, system should be intuitive) **And is correct**	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**	includes each persona that will use the system AND Has logins and passwords AND clear instructions to review the system, if needed **And is almost correct**	No submission OR No URL OR No logins or passwords OR Unclear instructions OR **Is incorrect** OR More than 1 page
BUILD					
Use/ Security and Maintainability					
Use - Quality/ working/User journey **Security**	Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required needs no improvement, can be released Implemented ideas to ensure very secure	Reflects a mastery of what is required needs some improvement, but could be released considered and implemented	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 Details to check against Use and Security

**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 step of the user journey are carefully thought out and appropriate.
- Spelling, grammar, imagery, layout, button placement, consistency, etc are all well thought out and appropriate
- Conforms to accepted development standards

Security	Can people access content which should only be available to other users, are passwords hashed appropriately, are secret documents publicly accessible, are users able to upload malicious files, is your application vulnerable to injection attacks

Maintainability

Readability - The code is	exceptionally well organized and very easy to follow.	The code is well organized and easy to follow.	The code is fairly easy to read.	The code is readable only by someone who knows what it is supposed to be doing.	The code is poorly organized and very difficult to read
Reusability	The code routines are reused or will be.	The code could be reused as a whole or each routine could be reused	Most of the code could be reused in other programs.	Some parts of the code could be reused in other programs	The code is not organized for reusability.
Documentation is	well commented and clearly explains what and how it is accomplishing and is easily able to be maintained	The documentation is quite well written and explains what the code is accomplishing and how. With thought, it could be easily maintained.	The documentation consists of embedded comment and some simple header documentation that is somewhat useful in understanding the code.	Only a few comments embedded in the code with some simple header comments separating routines	There is no documentation
Efficiency	The code is extremely efficient without sacrificing readability and understanding.	The code is quite efficient and structured well without sacrificing readability and understanding.	The code is efficient and understandable but could be better structured.	The code lacks structure and is hard to read and understand	The code is huge and appears to be patched together.
Architecture	Easy to understand, any plugins/themes used meaningfully documented	**Architecture** Easy to understand, plugins used meaningfully documented	**Architecture** Easy to understand, plugins used meaningfully documented	**Architecture** Easy to understand, plugins used meaningfully documented	**Architecture** Easy to understand, plugins used meaningfully documented

Criteria	HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required	D Good Reflects a mastery 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 Unacceptable Fails to identify what is required
Retrospective Artifact					
A reflection on processes What went well, what didn't go well, and how can we improve? Max 1 pages	Exceptionally well thought out and planned, AND Critical thinking is obvious in changes in processes needed. Accurate and comprehensive and clearly focused, organised and logical. AND About processes only AND Shows profound understanding of retrospectives and the reasoning behind them	Quite well thought out and planned, AND Some thought obvious in changes to processes needed AND Accurate / comprehensive and clearly focused, organised and logical. AND About processes only AND Shows understanding of retrospectives and the reasoning behind them	Planned and thought about adequately AND Understanding changes needed accurate and comprehensive and clearly focused, easy to understand AND Mostly referring to changes in processes AND Shows understanding of reasons for retrospectives	Each of the required areas of a retrospective defined, AND Changes needed are accurate and necessary AND Useful but includes changes that are not about processes AND Shows some understanding of retrospectives and the reasoning behind them	Seems that there is no idea what a retrospective is, OR No idea about what should be the content of a retrospective OR notes meaningless or nonexistent. OR Not about processes in any way OR More than 2 pages

Client acceptance testing report with feedback					
Matches high level but meaningful functional requirements needed for this iteration **Should not have acceptance criteria**	Matches acceptance testing report in iteration report (or has valid reasons if not) AND Has appropriate front pages and sign off clearly AND Has considered critically client workflow to aid acceptance testing e.g **User journey** AND May have an effective diagram to help AND Was explained to the clients face to face.	Mostly matches testing report in iteration report or has valid reasons if not) AND Has thought about client workflow to aid acceptance testing.eg **User journey** AND was explained to the clients face to face. AND Has appropriate front pages and sign off facility AND Was explained to the clients face to face.	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.	Mostly matches testing report in iteration report but reasons are acceptable OR Has not considered how the client will carry out acceptance test OR Does not have a meaningful front page and signoff facility	Does not match testing report in any way with no valid reasons for differences OR Has acceptance criteria listed for client to use OR Has no front page and sign off facility OR Was emailed to the client for acceptance testing without actually speaking to them face to face.

Special 3048 Iteration 1 UG IE Assessment Criteria Rubric - S2 2022 Version 1

Criteria	HD Excellent Reflects the highest level of performance, beyond what is required	D Good Reflects a mastery 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 Unacceptable Fails to identify what is required
PIR					
	Comprehensive, accurate and logical, clearly describing client feedback AND Client as audience in mind is obvious AND Succinct and no waffle, lean 1- 2 pages AND Actions to solve any issues	Comprehensive, accurate and logical, clearly describing client feedback AND Client as audience in mind is obvious AND Almost succinct, but with some waffle, lean, 1- 2 pages AND Actions to solve any issues	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	Some aspects missing OR Client /mentor may need further explanation . OR Actions to solve only some of the issues OR More than 3 pages	Major aspects of approach missing OR Difficult for client /mentors to understand OR No actions to solve any issues OR More than 4 pages

PGP Ongoing Reviewed Every Studio	**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**	**Up To Date, items in correct folders, meaningful and usable**	**Not Up To Date, or items not in correct folders, but still usable. Team has some understanding of purpose**	**Not up To Date, items not in correct folders, Shows no understando f purpose**
Testing details:	Records/Documents clear and complete and up to date Processes used to test iterations, (people, types of testing, any software used, what was tested) Test cases - samples given to show what you used and how you tested. Should relate to acceptance criteria, on user stories.				

Maintenance/ System/ Techdoc:	To be used for maintenance in the future and should enable modifications to be made easily
	
	Records/ Documents clear and complete and up to date.
	May include (and only if used):
	System Architecture (Architecture of technology use), may be diagrams/lists of modules used, system activity diagrams, ER conceptual diagrams
	
	Technologies used/Technical specification
	    ● Updated use cases (if used, due to changes in functionality requested by client from original use cases)
	    ● Working updated detailed data models (i.e. updated from new areas that you have understood from further analysis) and so on.
	
	Any scripts etc with - Well labeled and good naming conventions, formatting, understandability, etc.				

Special 3048 Iteration 1 UG IE Assessment Criteria Rubric - S2 2022 Version 1

Client interactions Includes, meeting minutes, Agendas, emails, notes, presentations	appropriate, useful and usable And up to date, Exceptional thought gone into othansation for later use by client	appropriate, useful and usable And up to date, A great deal of thought gone into othansation for later use by client	appropriate, useful and usable And up to date, Some thought gone into organisation for later use by client	Mostly appropriate, useful and usable And up to date, Othansation for later use by client could be better, but the client would be able to find things	NOT appropriate, useful and usable Not up to date, No obvious understanding how client would use them,
Dev artefacta .e.g user story mapping, flowcharts, process//activity diagrams,Interface mock-ups, rough sketches, user journeys mind maps etc. Photos of drawings are fine	Up to date, obviously used, Possible to see how the team moved from their data and information collection to their understanding of what was needed. Good analysis and design artifacts used to facilitate understanding of client's requirements and achieve this deliverable: what you used to get to this point		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.		No evidence of how team got from information gathering to results Or Artefacts made up, ie they were not used for this task
Feedback from mentors	**All feedback noted, meaningful and extremely well organised organised**		**All feedback noted, meaningful and well- organised organised**		No feedback form mentors focumented