

Assessment SOD

Author: Patricia Lago (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Date: 11 August 2021

The lecturers will assess the work performed by each student as described in this document.

1. GRADING

The final grade is established as follows.

Case assignments There are two assignments (assignments 1 and 2) based on a common practical case. They will be done in teamwork and will account jointly for 80% of the final grade. We judge you as reported in the table below; see the clarification in Section 2.

Individual responsibility The individual responsibility will be evaluated on the final assignment, i.e. Assignment 2, which includes the revised Assignment 1 as well. In general, the team will decide how to distribute the responsibility for each section of both assignment documents among the team members. Distribution should be balanced as much as possible. Next to his or her contribution to the project, the student has to make sure that the section (or sections) of responsibility are completed in time and with high-quality inputs from the contributing team members. Also, s/he will make sure that the contents are harmonized in, and consistent with, the overall document. This part will account for 20% of the final grade.

Final grade The final score is calculated by summing the weighted scores of the two assignments, and the individual responsibility. All scores must be 5.5 or higher to pass the course. The final result is averaged as customary.

	Exceeds expectations	n.a.	Meets expectations	n.a.	Below expectations	n.a.
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Sufficient	Insufficient	n.a.
Assignment 1						
Business domain						
Requirements (functional and quality)						
Business services						
Design space						
Sustainability strategies						
Structure and layout + Document quality						
Assignment 2						
Software decomposition of business services						
Inventory identification						
Service contract identification						
Business service network						
Design view						
Structure and lay-out+ Document quality						
Consistency and addressed feedback						
Individual responsibility						
(Averaged) score of the section/s						
Harmonization/consistency						

2. CLARIFICATION OF THE TERMS

The assessment criteria used in the table are defined in the following. This is in part based on the Final Assessment Master Project form of the Faculty of Science for writing a Master Thesis. This document closes with the official fraud disclaimer.

Assignment 1 - Case

- Business Domain: is the description of the usage scenario clear? Are the identified participants and their interactions sound?
- Requirements (functional and non-functional): are the requirements relevant for the assignment? Are they the most important ones? Are the selected quality requirements service aspects? Are they correctly and clearly defined? Do they carry a name and identifier?
- Business Services: are the business services correctly described and modelled? Are the UML diagrams correct?
- Design space: is the chosen design concern relevant? Is it clear and correctly defined? Are the options and criteria relevant and correctly defined? Is the assessment of each option against the criteria correct and motivated? Is the decision correct and motivated?
- Sustainability strategies: is the strategy relevant? Is it correctly described? Is the QOC-mapping correct? Is it consistent with the overall design space?
- Structure and layout + Document quality: does the document contain a header including title, group ID, group-members (described by name, student ID, email, master program and track)? Is there a proper use of figures and graphs? Was the overall layout appealing? Is the use of the language correct as to grammar and spelling? Are the contents clear? Does the document include reflection? Are figures and diagrams accompanied by appropriate text?

Assignment 2 - Case

- Software decomposition of business services: for each business service, are the corresponding software services well defined and complete? Are service types correctly identified and motivated where necessary?
- Inventory identification: are inventories correctly identified and defined? Are they complete?
- Service contract identification: are service contracts correctly and completely identified? Do they carry an appropriate name / ID?
- Business service network: is the SoaML diagram correct? Is the illustrated model semantically correct? Is the accompanying text appropriate?
- Design view: does the provided view appropriately illustrate the target concern/s? Is it clear and well defined? Is the accompanying text appropriately complementing the view?
- Structure and layout + Document quality: does the document contain a header including title, group ID, group-members (described by name, student ID, email, master program and track)? Is there a proper use of figures and graphs? Was the overall layout appealing? Is the use of the language correct as to grammar and spelling? Are the contents clear? Does the document include reflection? Are figures and diagrams accompanied by appropriate text?
- Consistency and addressed feedback: where applicable, is Assignment 2 consistent with Assignment 1? Are inconsistencies motivated (e.g. due to later corrections introduced in Assignment 2)? And is the feedback provided on Assignment 1 correctly addressed in Assignment 2 (see also the 'Change log' in Assignment 2)?

Individual responsibility

- (Averaged) score of the section/s: how is the assessment of the quality of the section/s for which the team member has been responsible?

- harmonization/consistency: in spite of different team members contributing to parts of the section/s, was the style and presentation harmonized in, and made consistent with, the overall document?

Fraud

Information exchange and collaboration are fully allowed within your own group. Cases of plagiarism or inter-group collaboration and assignment contents exchange will be reported to and managed by the official fraud committee. In case of fraud, the consequences of those acts may potentially lead to: formal warning, inclusion of the formal warning in your VU student file, suspension from giving exams for a given period, expulsion from the VU.

What happens in case of an insufficient score?

It may happen that you score less than 5.5 in either of the two assignments or in the individual responsibility. In such an unfortunate situation (i.e. of one insufficient score), you will have a second chance to recover that part within the current academic year. If, however, you score insufficiently in two or more parts, the situation will be discussed on a case-by-case manner as in principle you should retake the course.

The following explains how you can recover the insufficient part:

- **Assignment 1 or 2:** you should submit a revised and corrected assignment document that addresses the feedback received by the course tutor. Submit the revised document (strictly in PDF format) on [Canvas](#) (assignment 1 within Period 1, assignment 2 within period 2).
- **Individual responsibility:** you should revise assignment 2 for the sections you are responsible for, and add a section called “Final reflection” discussing how you would improve the way you managed your responsibility. Submit the revised document (strictly in PDF format) on [Canvas](#) (within period 2).