

Team Project 2022-23

S1 Ranking Criteria - guidelines

February 2023

General guidance

Why do we need these guidelines?

In Milestone 1 the team will decide the ranking of individual work within the team submitted in Submission 1. The team will be able to report non-contributions or low-contributions, and we will investigate these. The team will decide the ranking criteria and this document gives some guidance of what is acceptable and not.

Effect on grade

In M1 the team will be required to submit:

“A list with rankings individual team members in Submission 1. For each member of the team you should include up to 100 words on the criteria and feedback that led to the ranking. Put any non-submissions or too-low-contribution as N/A. Equal ranks are not allowed. Individual grades will not be affected by the ranking unless the no-submissions or too-low-contribution.

Assessed on: ranking criteria/feedback used to rank, fairness and consistency.”

Plagiarism and professional issues

S1 must be your own work, you cannot submit any work done by any other team member. Plagiarism can be reported to the module leader or anonymously to welfare and will be dealt via University policy.

Sharing work

After submission, you must share your individual work with your team. You can upload your work to the Files section of your team on Canvas, or use any other way (e.g. OneDrive, git), so your team has access to everyone's contribution. You can share the source files/documents used to create your submission the same way.

Contribution and professional issues

Individual contribution to team work affects everyone in your team. Not submitting to Submission 1 (without a welfare referral) will result in a referral directly to the College engagement team. This can result in a formal letter and invitation to a meeting.

1 Ranking guide

These lists are only a guideline for the ranking system teams can use for S1. The team must decide and agree the criteria together. The team might assign a different importance to the criteria, or have a different breakdown within these criteria. It is important to develop and apply whatever criteria the team decide fairly. Some of the below design criteria is based on Dieter Rams' 10 Principles of Good Design.

Mockups

1. Format:
 - follows an agreed format
 - similar enough to the agreed format
 - different to the agreed format
2. Link to concept:
 - links clearly and well to the team's app concept
 - fits well within the app
 - unclear link to the concept
 - different concept than agreed
3. Innovation of feature mocked up:
 - clearly innovative, original design
 - has elements of innovative design
 - very similar to existing solutions
 - different concept than agreed
4. How useful is the mockup are to get feedback:
 - Users are excited and enthusiastic to feedback on this
 - Have already got some useful feedback from the design
 - Not useful to get feedback from users
5. Usefulness of feature for the personas:
 - Feature is crucial to the usefulness of the app for the personas
 - Feature makes the app useful for the personas
 - Feature may not help the personas
6. The aesthetics of the mockup:
 - Is beautifully aesthetic
 - Looks good
 - Aesthetics could be improved
7. Suitability of AI (AI features/teams)
 - AI is applied appropriately to the feature
 - AI could be applied to the feature
 - AI could may not work/be possible/achievable for this feature

Personas

1. believe-ability of personas:
 - uses real data from people, has real data
 - maybe based on a real person with some guesses
 - clearly contrived persona
2. Usefulness of the personas:
 - Will clearly help development direction in Kanban cards and discussion
 - Somewhat useful to help development
 - Generic so not useful
3. Details of relevant scenarios, assumptions and knowledge about the personas:
 - Very detailed breakdown of the persona needs that increases understanding
 - Somewhat useful detail of needs
 - Little detail

Kanban feature cards

1. Details level in Kanban cards:
 - Excellent and could be picked up by any team member
 - Good visual representation of work needed
 - Overly verbose/too short/unclear
2. References in Kanban cards:
 - Clear references to persona, feature, mockups
 - Some indirect link to project elements
 - unclear link to other elements
3. Practicalities in Kanban cards:
 - Tagged/shared in the agreed format/boards
 - Shared in the agreed format/boards
 - Not in the agreed format/boards

git commits

1. Commits messages:
 - Useful commit messages
 - Unclear, commit message
 - Blank commit messages
2. Commits Practicalities:
 - Evidence of commit to correct repo/agreed file(s), using SSH
 - Not in the agreed format/repo/file