

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).

Team Health Check

Worth 1 CoursePoint (from Teamwork points)

Rubric: 0..1

- Percentage of survey questions answered

Week 5 Deliverables

Worth 4 CoursePoints (from Deliverables points)

Rubric: out of 90 pts

Use Case Diagram (15pts)

- (8pts) Correctness and completeness of the diagram
 - (1pt) 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 (minimum of 5 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)
- (4pts) 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 (<<includes>>, <<extends>>)
- (3pts) Descriptions of use cases and actors (complete and clear)
Outstanding, Excellent (3pts), Very Good (2.5pts), Satisfactory (2pts), Unsat (<2pts)

Week 5 Deliverables

Workflow Diagrams (60pts)(20pts per workflow model)

(10) Content/Completeness

- 5pts Choosing overly simple use case
- 1pt missing activity/process
- 2pts missing part of the workflow (only shows system actions and not workflow actions outside the system)
- 1pt missing actor, sink, source, data store, decision
- 1-3pts Activity Diagram syntax (start/end, activity, flows, decisions, synchronizations, actors, swim lanes, control flows (cf. data flows))
- 1-3pts DFD syntax (actors, sources/sinks, data stores, information flows (cf. control flows))

(3) Level of Detail of Model

- 0.5 too many processes in DFD
- 0.5 too many activities by same actor in the row in AD
- 0.5 missing synchronization (to model flows where the order of activities does not matter)
- 0.5 missing labels on information flows in DFD

(2) Appropriateness of model type activity diagram vs dataflow diagram

(2) Clarity of explanation of chosen model type

Excellent (2), Satisfactory (1.5), Unsatisfactory (<1.5)

(3) Completeness and Clarity of workflow model descriptions

Excellent (3), Good (2.5), Satisfactory (2), Unsatisfactory (<2)

Week 5 Deliverables

Quality Attributes (15pts)

(6pts) Six distinct quality attributes that are relevant to the team's project, and explanations of how each attribute applies to the project

- e.g., what does performance, scalability *mean* in the context of this project?
- What is the unit of measure for each quality attribute?

(3pts) Relevance of the six quality attributes to the team's project

(3pts) Clarity and Unambiguity of the description of each quality attribute
is it possible for different interviewees to interpret the quality attribute differently (e.g., with respect to different metrics)?

(3pts) Professionalism of the writeup