

Team Attendance

Worth 1 CoursePoint (from Teamwork marks)

Rubric: 0 or 1

- This is an individual mark.
- 1 CoursePoint is earned for each Tuesday team meeting attended, capped at 8 CoursePoints.
- There are 10 eligible meetings (weeks 3-12), thus each student can miss 2 meetings without penalty (other than the natural consequences of friction with teammates, additional coordination hassles, etc).

Buddy Team Activity

Worth 1 CoursePoint (from Teamwork points)

Rubric: out of 10 pts

- (2pt) List of participating teams and members (your team + buddy team(s))
- (1pt) Description of the elicitation techniques used
- (3pts) Description of reasonable, distinct **relevant** new features, use cases, or extensions
 - (3pts) 12 or more, (2.5pts) 10-11, (2pts) 7-9, (1.5pts) 4-6, (1pt) 1-3, (0pts) 0
- (2pts) Selection of 2 most interesting and **orthogonal use cases**
 - including (1pt) for rationale of their selection
- (2pts) Buddy team's evaluation of your team's participation
 - Based on buddy team's write-up of their responses to feedback
 - (2) outstanding, excellent (1.5) very good, good (1) satisfactory, (<1) unsatisfactory

Week 4 Deliverables

Worth 4 CoursePoints (from Deliverables points)

Rubric: out of 90 pts

Problem-Fit Interview Report (30pts)

- (5pts) Quality of 5 Questions (with respect to targeting **key hypotheses**, phrased as **scientific hypotheses, unbiased, not leading** questions)
 - -1pt per deficiency, max -1pt per question
- (8pts) Interviewee demographics(age, gender, location, education, etc.)
 - (4pts) Completeness of description of demographics of anonymized interviewees
 - (4pts) Degree to which interviewee demographics match target customer segment
- (12pts) Analysis of Interview Responses
 - Number of interviews (min of 5)
 - Completeness of interview results
 - Quality of the Analysis, Appropriateness of the pivot hypothesis (if any)
 - Outstanding (12pts), Excellent (10.5pts), Very Good (9pts), Satisfactory (7pts), Unsat (<7)
- (5pts) Professionalism of the writeup

Week 4 Deliverables

Use Case Diagram (30pts)

- (10pts) Correctness and completeness of the diagram
 - (-2pts) for each missing/wrong external agent, user, adjacent system
 - (1pt) for an internal component that is modelled as an adjacent system
 - (-2pts) for each missing use case (exactly 3 **rich**, **orthogonal** use cases)
 - (-1pt) for each extra/missing information flow
 - (-1pt) syntax error (e.g., non-verb use case names, annotations on communication flows, arrow syntax, misplaced actors, improper use of generalization)
- (10pts) Appropriate level of detail, with respect to use cases and information flows
 - (-2pts) use cases are too detailed (are phases of a use case rather than a full use case)
 - (-2pts) too many sub use cases (e.g., uses <<includes>>, <<extends>>)
 - (-1pt) multiple edges for multiple flows
- (10pts) Descriptions of use cases and actors (complete and clear)
 - Outstanding (10pts), Excellent (9pts), Very Good (8pts), Satisfactory (7pts), Unsat (<7pts)

Week 4 Deliverables

6-9 User Stories (30pts)

- Correctness and Completeness

(-5pts) for each missing/wrong user story

- collection of stories neglect a major step/phase of a use case
- stories are inconsistent with steps, phrases, constraints in the use-case diagram + descriptions

(-5pts max) Role in some stories is not a user; or requirement is not expressed from user perspective

- (-3pts max) if role is some stories should be narrower

(-5pts max) Not expressed using user story syntax

(-5pts max) Missing/wrong/weak rationale component of user stories

(-15pts max) Degree to which stories are solution oriented (cf. goal oriented)

Peer Evaluations

Worth 2 CoursePoints (from Teamwork points)

Rubric: out of 5 pts

Team Leader

(3 pts) For expected peer evaluation (as described on the Projects webpage)

(0-2 bonus pts) For outstanding peer evaluation (insight into peers' performance)

(-1pt) For each late day

(0 pts) Missing peer evaluation

Non Team Leader

Mark assigned by team leader.