



[Home](#) > [Undergraduate](#) > [Professional Computing 3200](#) > [Project](#)

## CITS3200 PROFESSIONAL COMPUTING

---

[Home](#)

[Lectures](#)

[Project](#)

[Timetable](#)

[Resources](#)

[Help3200](#)

[Lecture Times](#)

[Unit Outline](#)

### Sprint 1 Marking Criteria

When marking the project the following scheme will be used as a guide. Maximum marks for a criterion, eg 5/5, will only be awarded sparingly. The marks for group-based part of Sprint 1 will be the sum of the individual criteria. The marking criteria of the components of Sprint 1 are:

- The overall quality of the Scope of Work/Epic as a document (/5).  
What is being assessed here is not the format, but the clarity, both in the use of language and as a logical exposition of the work to be done.
  - 0 Absent or totally garbled
  - 1 The document is: incoherently laid out; has little evidence of proof reading; inconsistent; difficult to use
  - 2 The document has a little useful content but is seriously deficient on the other criteria
  - 3 A reasonable standard of presentation but has many small defects or content is imprecise or inconsistent
  - 4 Very few errors in presentation
  - 5 Remarkable job. Has high clarity and appeal
- Acceptance Tests (/4)
  - 0 Absent or meaningless
  - 1 A rudimentary set of tests which do not appear to challenge even a basic set of requirements
  - 2 A reasonable set of tests but with some shortcomings in scope or presentation
  - 3 A clearly defined set of tests which appear useful
  - 4 A comprehensive set of tests which are perfectly specified and exercise all the use cases corresponding to the top \$70 (70%) of value
- Skills and Resources Audit (/4)
  - 0 No skills audit
  - 1 Just a token effort
  - 2 Rudimentary, but some evidence of thought
  - 3 Solid audit of what the Team has versus what will be required for the project
  - 4 The Team has really thought of everything
- Risks Register (/4)
  - 0 No risk register
  - 1 Just a token effort
  - 2 Rudimentary, but some evidence of thought
  - 3 Solid audit of the risks the project may face and what the Team will do to mitigate those risks
  - 4 The Team has really thought of everything

- Coherence and reasonableness of the set of Sprint 2 (i.e. intermediate) goals (/5)
    - 0 No plan
    - 1 Incoherent set of goals that bear little relationship to desired final outcomes
    - 2 Sprint 2 goals bear some relationship to final outcome
      - Sprint 2 goals clearly heading to final outcome, but are either too close
    - 3 (essentially just final goal recapitulated) or too unambitious, leaving far too much for the final Sprint
    - 4 A solid set of goals, with appropriate phasing, but something missing
    - 5 An extremely solid plan
- 

*Department of Computer Science & Software Engineering*

*The University of Western Australia*

Last modified: 1 July 2020

Created by: Michael Wise

