

Marking Rubrics

| Preliminary Report (20%) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Key assessment | Criteria | CO | Unacceptable (0) | Poor (1) | Marginal (2) | Average (3) | Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
| PART A: Awareness and Importance of SQA (10%) | Listing the objectives of IRS (1.5%) | 1 | Objectives of IRS are not discussed at all. | Poor or unclear description of IRS objectives listing. | Objectives of IRS is quite clearly stated. | Objectives of IRS is correctly identified and well formulated. | Objectives of IRS is explicitly identified, described and analyzed. | Objectives of IRS is very clearly stated and analyzed, including discussion on dependencies and inter-relationships with other problems. |
| | Listing major components of IRS (1.5%) | 1 | Major components of IRS are not discussed at all. | Poor or unclear description of IRS Major components. | Major components of IRS is quite clearly stated. | Major components of IRS is correctly identified and well formulated. | Major components of IRS is explicitly identified, described and analyzed. | Major components of IRS is very clearly stated and analyzed, including discussion on dependencies and inter-relationships with other problems. |
| | Discuss the importance of SQA in relation to each major components of IRS (7%) | 1 | The importances of SQA in relation to major components of IRS are not stated. | The importances of SQA in relation to major components of IRS are poorly stated. | The importances of SQA in relation to each major components of IRS are stated. | The importance of SQA in relation to major components of IRS are stated and discussed. | The importance of SQA in relation to major components of IRS are stated, discussed and analyzed. | The importance of SQA in relation to major components of IRS are stated, discussed and analyzed in accordance to IRS objectives. |
| PART B: Formulation of Approaches for SQA (10%) | N/A | 2 | No formulation of SQA approaches are achieved. | Formulation of SQA approaches are general and not in-line with organization quality assurance directive | Formulation of SQA approaches partial in-line with organization quality assurance directive (i.e. adoption of framework, methodology and/or standards). | Formulation of SQA approaches is in-line with organization quality assurance directive (i.e. adoption of framework, methodology and/or standards). | The formulated approaches in-line with organizational QA directive covering either/partial phases of project life cycle OR well as software development life cycle | The formulated approaches in-line with organizational QA directive covering all phases of project life cycle as well as software development life cycle |
| PART C: Measurement of Approaches for SQA (10%) | Listing of software quality metrics (4%) | 4 | Listing of IRS quality metrics are not discussed at all. | Poor or unclear listing of IRS quality metrics. | listing of IRS quality metrics are quite clearly stated. | IRS quality metrics are correctly identified and well formulated. | IRS quality metrics is explicitly identified, described and analyzed. | IRS quality metrics are very clearly stated and analyzed, including discussion on dependencies and inter-relationships with other problems. |
| | Proposal of Measurement (6%) | 4 | No proposal of tools/methods for measuring the “high-level software quality assurance approaches” for IPS. | Poor of unclear proposal of tools/methods for measuring the “high-level software quality assurance approaches” for IPS. | Partial proposal of tools/methods for measuring the “high-level software quality assurance approaches” for IPS. | Proposal of appropriate tools/methods for measuring the “high-level software quality assurance approaches” for IPS. | Proposal of appropriate tools/methods for measuring the “high-level software quality assurance approaches” for IPS partially in relation to “software quality improvement”. | Proposal of appropriate tools/methods for measuring the “high-level software quality assurance approaches” for IPS in relation to “software quality improvement”. |
| PART D: Formulation of Approaches for SQA (70%) | List of software quality activities (20%) | 3 | Listing of quality activities are not discussed at all. | Poor or unclear listing of quality activities. | Listing of quality activities are quite clearly stated. | Quality activities are correctly identified and well formulated. | Quality activities is explicitly identified, described and analyzed. | Quality activities are very clearly stated and analyzed, including discussion on dependencies and inter-relationships with other problems. |
| | Effectiveness of SQA (20%) | 3 | The effectiveness of SQA to propose list of SQA activities are not discussed at all. | The effectiveness of SQA to propose list of SQA activities are poorly stated. | The effectiveness of SQA to propose list of SQA activities are quite clearly stated. | The effectiveness of SQA to propose list of SQA activities are ccorrectly stated. | The effectiveness of SQA to propose list of SQA activities and partial proposed approached are clearly stated and discussed. | The effectiveness of SQA to propose list of SQA activities and proposed approached are clearly stated, discussed and addressed. |
| | Justification/explanation in supporting the effectiveness of SQA implementation (30%) | 3 | Justification/explanation in supporting the effectiveness of SQA implementation are are not discussed at all | Justification/explanation in supporting the effectiveness of SQA implementation are are poorly stated without example | Justification/explanation in supporting the effectiveness of SQA implementation are quite clearly stated without example | Justification/explanation in supporting the effectiveness of SQA implementation are correctly stated without examples. | Justification/explanation in supporting the effectiveness of SQA implementation is explicitly identified, describes and analyzed using ONE(1) examples | Justification/explanation in supporting the effectiveness of SQA implementation is explicitly identified, describes and analyzed using TWO(2) examples |