

MSOE SE-3821 Final Requirements Report Rubric

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Evaluation Date and Time: | Monday 14 November 2005 10:00 AM |
| Project: | I Just Want to Immobilize Your Hand |
| Client or Client Advisor: | Dr. Fennigkoh |
| SE-3821 Professor: | Dr. Durant |
| Evaluator: | Dr. Suri |
| Team Members: | John Paul George H. Ringo Yoko George M. |

| | Beginning - 1 | Developing - 2 | Accomplished - 3 | Exemplary - 4 | Weight | Score | Comments |
|--|--|--|---|---|--------|-------|----------|
| Blastoff / Goals | Goals do not provide a rational product basis; list of stakeholders is superficial or incomplete | Goals are incomplete or unclear; stakeholders are superficially addressed | Goals are mostly complete, but the benefits and terminology are not always clear; stakeholders need to be defined in more detail | Goals are clearly articulated with documented advantages and measurement criteria; unambiguous terminology; comprehensive list of users and stakeholders | 10% | 2 | |
| Context Diagram / Business Events | Data flows are missing or so limited as to be unusable for UC generation; adjacent systems are missing or not sufficiently described | Key adjacent systems are missing, or most adjacent systems are ill defined | The diagram is mostly complete, but categorization is missing or key interactions or events are missing | Diagram is clearly documented and adjacent systems are clearly and logically categorized into the 3 types; appropriate modeling techniques are used (e.g., state diagram, ER diagram, mind maps); supporting materials referenced | 10% | 3 | |
| Risks | Risks are superficial, not researched, and do not show evidence of being managed or tracked | Some relevant risks are raised, but are not presented in sufficient detail | Key relevant risks are present, along with some management and mitigation information, but key pieces are missing | Proper tracking and monitoring are shown: detail, severity, likelihood, notes / mitigation strategies, date last assessed | 10% | 2.2 | |
| Glossary | Many terms are missing or there are numerous ambiguous usages | Most key terms are defined, but not in sufficient depth of be useful to the domain novice | The glossary is sufficient that a person working in the domain a short time would understand the document, but some terminology is overly redundant or ambiguous | As SRS is being read, all relevant terms were found in the glossary. Consistent terminology used throughout | 10% | 4 | |
| Constraints / Assumptions | Missing | Stated but completely unjustified | Reasonable items listed with basic support that leaves the reader with a list of questions that need to be answered | Areas are addressed and clearly documented support material is provided as appropriate | 10% | 2.3 | |
| Use Cases | Do not reflect primary business events and are not readily derivable from the work context diagram | Use cases are appropriate in scope, but superficial in detail, not providing enough information for design. Or, the UCs specify significant design constraints that are unjustified. | The purpose of the UC case is clear and there is sufficient detail to write good requirements, but some key items are missing from the template. UCs are appropriately chosen and cover most major functionality. Unjustified design constraints are kept to a minimum. | All sections are appropriately completed: description, actors, preconditions, basic flow, alternative flows, exception flows, etc. The UCs are sufficiently wide reaching to encompass the project goals. Any assumptions, constraints and risks specific to the UCs are documented. | 10% | 3.2 | |
| Functional Requirements | Severely incomplete in detail and coverage | FRs approach sufficient coverage, but are mostly ambiguous are missing many relevant items (e.g., Rationale) that may be necessary for each individual requirement. | FRs provide a sound basis for design, but are mostly lacking in traceability. Ambiguity is present, but is the exception and not the rule. | FRs are traceable to UCs or other process artifacts; FRs cover virtually all functionality per the goals and Use Cases. They are complete and unambiguous. | 10% | 3.6 | |
| Non-functional Requirements | Many categories unaddressed and measurement criteria are not provided | Most key categories are addressed, and coverage is nearly sufficient, but the NFRs are mostly ambiguous and missing many relevant items. | NFRs provide a sound basis for design, but are mostly lacking in traceability. Ambiguity is present, but is the exception and not the rule. | NFRs are provided in a variety of areas relevant to the project (operational, performance, security, political, cultural, etc.) and are properly traced to an artifact, most often a goal. | 10% | 4 | |
| Basis for V&V | Most requirements do not have a measurement criterion specified. | The FC are mostly ambiguous or multipartite without sufficient justification. | Nearly all Rs are written with FC that are sufficient for deriving test cases. Most FC are reasonable and clearly supported, when needed. | All Rs (F & NF) are written with measurement criteria and can be used to derive test cases. The specified measurement criteria are logical, or means for determining them are discussed. | 10% | 1.2 | |
| Postmortem Report | Missing or superficial | Some useful comments on the process are provided, but the key points of the postmortem are missed. | The report makes good observations of the process aspects, but is not sufficiently introspective and focused on the project goals and purpose. | The report is introspective, considers both the team's and client's point of view, and includes usable insight into what worked and did not work. | 10% | 1.2 | |
| | | | | | 100% | 2.67 | |