

Requirements Elicitation Marking Guideline

1. Functional Requirements (30%)

For the functional requirements' (RQs) assessment, you are expected to assess the quality of elicited functional requirements. Things to consider:

- **Functionality coverage:**
 - Does the report include 40 functional RQs?
 - Do the stated requirements cover all identified functionality from the domain analysis (especially key requirements)? For example, if they are offering an online music service check if the RQs capture ability to find and play music, playlists and etc.
 - Do the requirements capture all users?
 - Are the data requirements for key users specified?
- **The quality of requirements:**
 - Are all the RQs clear and precise (no ambiguities)?
 - Are all the RQs logical (for the proposed software)? For example, if you are building an on-board flight control system RQs shouldn't capture user login.
 - Are there any conflicting RQs?
 - Are all the data RQs correctly identified? For example, if there is a login RQ check if there is another RQ that specifies username/password.
 - Do they follow the correct terminology (including domain specific ones- you read the domain analysis report, so you should be familiar with the domain)?
- **Quality of writing:**
 - Are the requirements well written and easy to follow? No grammar or spelling mistakes and easy to understand.
 - Does it follow the given table format?

Marking guideline

- **Mark 5:** All the above is achieved without any mistakes.
- **Mark 4:** All the above is achieved (with minor issues).
- **Mark 3:** Stated RQs cover most of the functionality and users. There might be some confusing or not clear enough RQs. Correct terminology used where necessary.
- **Mark 2:** Stated RQs only cover the basic functionality and a small number of users. There is a high number of RQs with mistakes and ambiguities and maybe some repeated RQs. Correct terminology is not used where necessary.
- **Mark 1:** The RQs fail to cover almost all key functionality and users. All RQs are badly written and ambiguous.
- **Mark 0:** If the section is empty or missing.

Do not consider the length of the RQs when marking this section, the key in RQ elicitation is to capture the needs of the customer/user (or the system that will adequately solve the problem).

2. Non-functional Requirements (15%)

For the non-functional RQs' assessment, you are expected to assess the quality of elicited non-functional requirements. Things to consider:

- **Coverage:**
 - Do the stated requirements include key non-functional aspects of the described system?
 - Does the report include 10 non-functional RQs?
 - Are the types of non-functional RQs correctly identified?
- **The quality of requirements:**
 - Are the requirements clear and precise (no ambiguities)?
 - Are they stated as tangible and measurable expectations?
 - Are there any conflicting requirements?
 - Are all they logical (for the proposed software)? For example, if you are building an on-board flight control system RQs shouldn't capture usability.
 - Do they follow the correct terminology (including domain specific ones- you read the domain analysis report, so you should be familiar with the domain)?
- **Quality of writing:**
 - Are the requirements well written and easy to follow? No grammar or spelling mistakes and easy to understand.

Marking guideline

- **Mark 5:** All the above is achieved without any mistakes.
- **Mark 4:** All the above is achieved (with minor mistakes).
- **Mark 3:** Stated RQs cover most of the key aspects of the system. There might be some confusing or not clear enough RQs. Correct terminology used where necessary. Most of the RQs are tangible and measurable.
- **Mark 2:** Stated RQs doesn't include majority of key aspects and they are not measurable or tangible. There is a high number of RQs with mistakes and ambiguities and maybe some repeated RQs. Correct terminology is not used where necessary.
- **Mark 1:** Stated RQs doesn't include majority of key aspects and they are not measurable or tangible. All RQs are badly written and ambiguous.
- **Mark 0:** If the section is empty or missing.

3. Use-case Diagram (20%)

For the use-case diagram assessment, you are expected to assess the quality of use-case diagram. Things to consider:

- **Correctness of the diagram:**
 - Is the diagram drawn with correct UML elements?
 - Is it syntactically correct? No mistakes in UML.
- **Capture of use-cases:**
 - Does the diagram capture all use-cases defined in the domain analysis? As I mentioned in the forum, there might be some functionality such as a recommender function which is a part of system that is not captured as a use-case. A use-case is a specific way of using

- a system to accomplish something the system designed for such as withdraw money, loan a book or buy something.
- o Are the captured cases and associations logical?
- o Are all the cases associated with correct users?
- o Are all the actors captured?
- o Do the RQs correspond to a use-case? There might be some non-functional RQs such as a recommender module which might be captured as an RQ but might not correspond to a use case so be careful.

Marking guideline

- **Mark 5:** All the above is achieved without any mistakes.
- **Mark 4:** All the above is achieved (with minor mistakes).
- **Mark 3:** Stated use-cases cover most of the key functionality. There might be few major mistakes.
- **Mark 2:** Stated use-cases only cover the basic functionality and a small number of actors. Actors and key use-cases missing. There is a high number of UML errors.
- **Mark 1:** The use-cases doesn't include almost all key functionality and actors. The diagram is full of mistakes.
- **Mark 0:** If the section is empty or missing.

A major mistake is an error such as diagram having a use-case that shouldn't be identified as a use-case (a use-case called bill in a restaurant system, bill can be an entity not a use case however print bill might be a use-case) or an actor which is not specified as a part of the system in domain analysis.

4. Use-case description (20% => 2x10%)

In this section, you are expected to assess the quality of the described two use-cases. Things to consider:

- Does it include all the sections from the template report?
- Does it clearly explain every step?
- Are the explained steps logical (basic and alternate flows)?
- Is the writing clear and easy to follow?
- Does everything stated in the description correspond to the use-case?
- Are the actors correctly identified?
- If there are any pre and post conditions, check if they are logical.

Marking guideline:

- **Mark 5:** All the above is clearly explained without any mistakes.
- **Mark 4:** All the above is clearly explained (minor mistakes).
- **Mark 3:** All the above is explained adequately. There might be unclear sections or missing information needed to clearly explain the steps or conditions.
- **Mark 2:** Steps and conditions are not clearly explained. Missing key steps and actors and few sections might be missing or without any information.
- **Mark 1:** Majority of the sections are missing. Key steps and conditions, and actors are not stated.
- **Mark 0:** If the section is empty or missing.

5. Risk Assessment (15%)

In this section, you are expected to identify the potential risks in your project.

- Does the risk assessment follow the provided table (all columns)?
- Does the assessment follow the stated terms on the table?
- Does the table include at least 10 risks?
- Are all the stated risks potential ones for the given project?
- Are all the mitigation plans for stated risks sensible plans?
- Are the identified impacts expected ones for the stated risks?

Marking guideline:

- **Mark 5:** All stated risks are correct without any mistakes.
- **Mark 4:** Almost all the stated risks are correct without any mistakes. There might be one or two risks that are not potential risks for the project.
- **Mark 3:** Most all the stated risks are correct without any mistakes. There might be unclear parts or missing information needed to clearly explain the risks, impact or mitigation plan. There might be some risks that are not potential risks for the project.
- **Mark 2:** Missing key risks and few columns might be without any information. Many of the identified risks are not potential risks.
- **Mark 1:** Less than 10 risks were identified. Majority of the key risks were not identified. None of the identified risks are potential risks.
- **Mark 0:** If the section is empty or missing.