

3048 sem 2 2022 Marking Rubric for Systems overview with IT 1 additions (whole rubric)

	HD	D	C	P	N
	Demonstrate rigorous critical analysis. Comprehensive, accurate and logical, clearly reflecting the needs of the proposed system, audience taken into account.	Demonstrates in-depth analysis. Comprehensive, accurate and logical, reflecting the needs of the proposed system	Demonstrates proficient analysis. Mostly comprehensive, accurate and logical, generally reflecting the needs of the proposed system	Satisfactory analysis. Most aspects are complete, accurate and logical showing an understanding of the needs of the proposed system	Lack of satisfactory analysis or research. Some aspects may not be complete, inaccurate and illogical in many areas, showing limited understanding of the needs of the proposed system
5.1 Organization System Overview/Business Vision (written report)					
1. the client's business, and what they wish to achieve Who, what, why, where, when and how Problem to solve or goal to obtain Elevator Pitch (Example provided in Moodle)	Rigorous critical analysis of organization and client intent Clear / concise definitions who, what and why are well defined and correct. Demonstrating exceptional and insightful level of understanding of value-driven opportunities. Goals well defined. Using client terms . And broken down to ensure clarity of what client wants eg CRM is too large and can be broken down into 3 or 4 areas Innovative but appropriate approach The audience has clearly been taken into account Matches the example, in that it's short precise and meaningful does match the analysis above	Mostly in-depth analysis of org. and client intent Clear/ concise definitions who, what and why, demonstrating superior level understanding of the opportunity/ problem. The audience has clearly been taken into account Easily understood by the client And broken down to ensure clarity of what client wants eg CRM is too large and can be broken down into 3 or 4 areas Matches the example, in that it's short precise and meaningful it does match the analysis above	Proficient analysis of organisation and client intent Correct definitions who, what and answers the questions for the client Easily understood by the client And broken down to ensure clarity of what client wants eg CRM is too large and can be broken down into 3 or 4 area Matches (or almost) the example, in that it's short precise and meaningful and it does match the analysis above	Satisfactory analysis of organisation and client intent Mostly correct definitions who, what and why with acceptable Not so easy for the client to understand Some terms (jargon) NOT broken down to ensure clarity of what client wants eg CRM is too large and can be broken down into 3 or 4 area Does not Match the example, In that it isn't so precise, but it does match the analysis above	Limited analysis of organisation and client m intent Incorrectly defined needs work. The definition of who, what and why are not well stated The client would find it very difficult to understand Mainly Jargon used, NOT broken down to ensure clarity of what client wants eg CRM is too large Does not match the example, in that it's not short precise and meaningful or Does not match the analysis above
2. Top priorities, expectations for iteration 1	In depth analysis to form an appropriate and doable list Epics/ ideas that align with intent AND Using client terms Matches analysis carried out	Comprehensive analysis to form a comprehensive and prioritised list of Epics/ ideas that align with intent AND Using client terms	Proficient analysis to form a list of prioritised Epics/ ideas that align with intent AND Using client terms	Satisfactory analysis to form a list of Epics/ ideas that mostly align with intent OR Little thought to client terms used	Lack of satisfactory Analysis. Priority Epics/ ideas do not align with intent OR No thought to client terms Doesn't match Specification

3. Personas	All possible personas for this iteration AND Exceptional understanding of each AND Provides insightful analysis of demographics, age, education, goals, nuances and tasks they are trying to complete, with potential requirements and why that persona is there	All possible personas for this iteration AND Understanding of the target audience AND 80% of valuable information (see HD)	All possible personas for this iteration AND 60% of valuable information (see HD) AND an acceptable and useful understanding of their needs and requirements of why that persona is there	Some personas for this iteration AND Shows a basic understanding of what is required by each persona	No personas OR Shows a little to no understanding of what is required
4. High level timeline Not much detail beyond tasks such as iteration 1, analysis of needs, testing/acceptance date, delivery date, iteration 2 etc	Simple and succinct AND Covers 14 weeks with just the high level tasks Such as iteration 1, analysis of needs, testing/acceptance date, delivery date., iteration 2 etc AND is exceptionally well-presented So that it is meaningful and appropriate for the client	Simple and succinct AND Covers 14 weeks with just the high level tasks Such as iteration 1, analysis of needs, testing/acceptance date, delivery date., iteration 2 etc AND Plan is well-presented and appropriate for the client	Simple and succinct AND Covers 14 weeks with just the high level tasks Such as iteration 1, analysis of needs, testing/acceptance date, delivery date., iteration 2 etc AND Plan is quite well-presented and appropriate for the client	A little confusing for the client OR too long OR covers extra tasks that are not needed for this high level; plan OR doesn't include all 14 weeks.	No plan Or does not cover 14 weeks Or Very complicated with all mp. Tasks. on AND Audience not taken into account So it is difficult for the client to understand. So that it is meaningful and
5. Risks If NO risks this should be stated. No mention of technology unless appropriate (see risk doc. On Moodle)	Contains relevant risk items only real to this particular project (cannot be a risk to any or all projects), detailing likelihood and impact. AND Mitigation strategies are presented for every risk and are realistic, relevant and meaningful to the client AND Succinct and exceptionally audience (client) friendly	Contains relevant risk items only real to this particular project (cannot be a risk to any or all projects), detailing likelihood and impact. AND Mitigation strategies presented for every risk and are mostly realistic, relevant and meaningful to the client AND Succinct and well thought out for audience (client)	Contains relevant risk items only real to this particular project (cannot be a risk to any or all projects), detailing likelihood and impact. AND Mitigation strategies are presented But not realistic, relevant and meaningful to the client AND Succinct and audience (client) needs have been considered	One of the risk items is too general and not specific to this project OR Few mitigation strategies are presented OR Wordy and audience (client) needs have not been considered	75% or more of the risks are too general. Could be for any project and are meaningless. OR Section missing OR No mitigation strategies OR Very large section, where audience (client) needs have not been considered
6. Team members	Names and Correct roles and Individual photos , displayed innovatively with thought to the size of the document (ie not large) And Any extra relevant information considered important	Names and Correct roles and Individual photos , displayed meaningfully with thought to the size of the document (ie not large)	Names and correct roles and Individual photos displayed with thought to the size of the document (ie not too large)	Basic information about the team Displayed without much thought to their importance in this document, eg much too large compared to other content	No meaningful information about the team Displayed without any thought to their importance in this document, eg much too large compared to other content.

7. Sys dev. approach	<p>Comprehensive, accurate and logical, clearly describing iterative and client feedback approach</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Ability to change requirements/priorities</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Exceptional interface for the client understanding</p> <p>AND Succinct with no waffle</p>	<p>Comprehensive, accurate and logical, describing Iterative and client feedback approach</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Ability to change requirements/priorities</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Client as audience in mind is obvious</p> <p>AND succinct, with no waffle</p>	<p>Most aspects of approach defined, clearly describing Iterative and client feedback approach</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Ability to change requirements/priorities missing</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Client as audience in mind is obvious</p> <p>AND almost succinct, but no waffle</p>	<p>Some aspects of approach missing, INo mention of iterative and client feedback approach</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Ability to change requirements/priorities missing</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Client may need further explanation</p>	<p>Major aspects of approach missing,</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Difficult for client to understand</p>
Report Format					
Report Presentation / Format	<p>Professional well-structured report And Appropriate Business English used at all times in the document</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Critical thought has been put into layout and formatting g guidelines for layout (headings), spacing, alignment, headings, etc. readability.</p> <p>Include all required components</p> <p>Lean (Max 3/4 pages)</p>	<p>Professional well-structured report And Appropriate Business English used at all times in the document</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Extensive thought has been put into layout and formatting g guidelines for layout (headings), spacing, alignment, headings, etc. readability.</p> <p>Include all required components</p> <p>Lean (Max 3/4 -pages)</p>	<p>Professional well-structured report with few minor mistakes</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Appropriate Business English used mostly in with at most one or two grammatical errors</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Some thought has been put into layout and formatting guidelines for layout (headings), spacing, alignment, headings, etc. Readability.</p> <p>Includes all required component</p> <p>Leanish 4/5 pages at most</p>	<p>Basic structured report</p> <p>OR</p> <p>English used all times in the document with major grammatical errors throughout</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Little thought has been put into layout and formatting</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Some required components missing (but with reason)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Report contains some irrelevant information and more than 5 pages (up to 7) pages.</p>	<p>Unprofessional structure</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Poorly written, shows that no thoughts have been put into writing the report</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Missing parts/component (without reason)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Report contains some irrelevant information and more than 7 pages.</p>
5.2 Powerpoint Presentation for the client (10 mins max)					
See below for - professionally	<p>Content as per Specification</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Consideration of showing what value will be to the client (no low-level tasks such as log in)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Presented very professionally</p> <p>AND</p> <p>(feedback asked for and accepted graciously)</p>	<p>Content as per Specification</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Consideration of showing what value the next iteration will be to the client (no low-level tasks such as log in)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Presented very professionally</p> <p>AND</p> <p>(feedback accepted appropriately)</p>	<p>Content as per Specification</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Some thought into showing what value the next iteration will be to the client (no low-level tasks such as log in)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Presented mostly professionally (AND (feedback observed to be accepted appropriately)</p>	<p>Content NOT as per Specification</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Presentation does not show what value the next iteration will be to the client and/or wasting time with low level areas</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Presented averagely (OR (feedback not accepted appropriately)</p>	<p>Content NOT as per Specification</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Presentation of little use to client, le does not show value</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Presented unprofessionally OR feedback negatively accepted</p>

Client Comprehension (from body language and interaction with team)	Client understood completely what was happening, obviously at ease with team and excited about what was to be delivered	Client understood mostly what was happening. Body language & interaction show they were interested with their team but still wary.	Client appeared to understand what was happening, and the team encouraged them to interact.	Client was not sure what was happening, the team did not encourage the client to interact to ensure understanding	Client was disengaged, team did not attempt to clarify, client did not understand anything or the presentation																																																					
Organisation (team) Organisation of presentation to assist understanding, group dynamics, obviously understands audience as stated Team looks like you are working together, all of the team engaged Asking for feedback appropriately and proactively Evidence of collaboration, preparation and practice No repetition across the project			<table><tr><td>H D</td><td>D</td><td>C</td><td>P</td><td>N</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <table><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <table><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>			H D	D	C	P	N																																																
H D	D	C	P	N																																																						
Visual Aids (team) Visual aids used to assist in delivering the message, standards used to include team name, project name, professional Appropriate use of technology																																																										
Delivery Ability to answer questions, observed to be taking feedback Engages/excites the audience, Persuasive, confident, knowledgeable. Will vary across team members – but a general grade for all (so you need to support your team members!)																																																										
Time constraints met																																																										

5.3 Project Governance Portfolio - Business Vision folder

1. Conceptual Data Model; ER diagram	<p>Model is accurate and logical (business rules obvious and correct) with critical thinking obvious</p> <p>Shows a very strong grasp of the technique</p>	<p>Model is accurate and logical (business rules obvious and correct), showing some level of critical thinking</p> <p>Shows a good grasp of technique</p>	<p>Model is mainly accurate with few logic errors, showing limited critical thinking, Business rules identified well.</p> <p>Shows some understanding of the technique</p>	<p>Model is inaccurate and illogical in many areas, showing limited critical thinking. Business rules are wrong or missing</p> <p>Shows little understanding of the techniques</p>	<p>Models are mainly inaccurate and illogical or missing completely</p> <p>Shows no grasp of techniques</p>
2. Backlog - all stories, ideas do far. High level stories - it. 1 moved to the waiting column.	<p>Expectations for iteration 1 in to do column, ready to be broken down</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Numbered -</p>	<p>Expectations for iteration 1 in to do column, ready to be broken down</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Numbered -</p>	<p>Expectations for iteration 1 in the waiting column, ready to be broken down.</p>	<p>Does not understand requirements for this section</p> <p>Or expectations in wrong column (not the waiting lane)</p>	<p>Does not understand requirements for this section</p>
3. Client interactions <p>Includes, meeting minutes, Agendas, emails, notes, presentations</p>	<p>appropriate, useful and usable</p> <p>And up to date,</p> <p>Exceptional thought gone into othansation for later use by client</p>	<p>appropriate, useful and usable</p> <p>And up to date,</p> <p>A great deal of thought gone into othansation for later use by client</p>	<p>appropriate, useful and usable</p> <p>And up to date,</p> <p>Some thought gone into othansation for later use by client</p>	<p>Mostly appropriate, useful and usable</p> <p>And up to date,</p> <p>Othansation for later use by client could be better, but the client would be able to find things</p>	<p>NOT appropriate, useful and usable</p> <p>Not up to date,</p> <p>No obvious understanding how client would use them,</p>
4. Dev artefacta <p>.e.g user story mapping, flowcharts, process//activity diagrams, Interface mock-ups, rough sketches, user journeys mind maps etc.</p> <p>Photos of drawings are fine</p>	<p>Up to date, obviously used,</p> <p>Possible to see how the team moved from their data and information collection to their understanding of what was needed.</p> <p>Good analysis and design artifacts used to facilitate understanding of client's requirements and achieve this deliverable: what you used to get to this document. t</p>		<p>Up to date, obviously used, not made up for mentors' benefit</p> <p>Have a good diea of how to use of artifacts to achieve results</p> <p>Possible to see how the team moved from their data and information collection to their understanding of what was needed.</p>		<p>No evidence of how team got from information gathering to results</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Artefacts made up, ie they were not used for this task</p>