

# 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 remaining meetings, thus each student can miss 2 meetings without penalty (other than the natural consequences of friction with teammates, additional coordination hassles, etc).

# Week 6 Deliverables

**Worth 3 CoursePoints (from Deliverables points)**  
**Rubric: out of 90 pts**

## **Interviewee demographics (age, gender, location, education, etc.) (5pts)**

- (2.5pts) Completeness of description of demographics of anonymized interviewees
- (2.5pts) Degree to which interviewee demographics match target customer segment

## **Quality Attribute Prioritization (100-dollar) (12pts)**

- 2pts missing descriptions of quality attributes
- 5pts not showing how each of 5 stakeholders distributed dollars
- 1pt not showing the sum of priority dollars distributed to each attribute
  - 0.5pts if the points don't add up to 100 x number of stakeholders
- 4pts missing summary of results, including
  - 2pts total priority ordering of quality attributes
  - 2pts relative priority among quality attributes

# Week 6 Deliverables

## Rich Fit Criteria (10pts)

- 5pts not showing each of 5 stakeholder's rich fit criteria (for 3 attributes)  
minimum, target, outstanding values for each stakeholders' 3 top-priority attributes  
OK to have different numbers of responses for each attribute
- 1pt unrealistic rich fit criteria (e.g., 0 security breaches, 0ms response time)
- 3pts missing mean averages and standard deviations for quality attributes  
Plan B (2pts) If stakeholder responses cannot be averaged (because responses are with respect to different units of measure), then write-up should say how the stakeholder responses have been combined into a single minimum, target, and outstanding values and should provide the stakeholders' range of values rather than STD.
- 2pts missing summary assessment that includes (based on STD) an explanation of whether more interviews are needed to gain greater confidence in quality requirements

## Professionalism of the writeup (3pts)

# Week 6 Deliverables

## Kano Prioritization Interviews (30pts)

For each of five Use Cases (4pts per use case)

- 0.25pt missing description of use case
- 0.5pt each missing stakeholder answer to functional and dysfunctional Kano questions for that use case (max -2)
- 1pt missing/incorrect average functional, dysfunctional values for the use case
- 1pt missing/incorrect standard deviation for functional, dysfunctional values for the use case

## Categorization Plane (10pts)

- 5pts incorrect plot of use cases on categorization plane with axes that list functional and dysfunction values
- 2pts plot is missing standard deviation ranges
- 3pts missing/incorrect summary assessment that explains the total and relative priority orderings among use cases  
(2pts for providing a correct priority orderings without explanation)

# Week 6 Deliverables

## **Risk Consequences Table (14pts)**

- 0.5pt for each missing requirement (should be 5 req, one for each of 5 use cases)
- 1.5pts for each missing risk with description (there should be 4 risks)
- 0.5pt lack of reasonableness of each likelihood (of 4); rationale should be clear
- 1pt if requirements' weights do not align with their Kano prioritizations
- 0.5 pt lack of reasonableness of each impact (of 5), with clear rationale for the risk impact that has the greatest impact for each of 5 requirements

## **Risk Countermeasures Table (8pts)**

- 1.5pt for each missing countermeasure with description (there should be 4)
- 0.5 pt lack of reasonableness of each impact (should be 4), with clear rationale for each countermeasure's greatest impact in mitigating some risk

# Week 6 Deliverables

## **Mitigated Risks Graph (8pts)**

- 2pts for optimal choice of countermeasures to adopt, with clear explanations of countermeasure choices
- 4pts for computation of mitigations of all risk criticalities, with explanations (need to show work in how reduced criticalities are computed)
- 2pts for bar chart showing original and mitigated risk criticalities

# Risk Computations

$$\text{Loss of objective(req)} = \text{weight(req)} * \sum_{\text{risk}} \text{likelihood(risk)} * \text{impact(risk, req)}$$

$$\text{Risk criticality(risk)} = \text{likelihood(risk)} * \sum_{\text{req}} \text{weight (req)} * \text{impact(risk, req)}$$

$$\text{Overall Effect of Mitigation(cm)} = \sum_{\text{risk}} \text{criticality(risk)} * \text{impact(cm, risk)}$$

$$\text{Reduction of Risk Criticality(risk)} = 1 - \prod_{\text{cm}} (1 - \text{impact(cm, risk)})$$

$$\text{Mitigated Risk(risk)} = \text{criticality(risk)} * \prod_{\text{Selected cm}} (1 - \text{impact(cm, risk)})$$

# 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.