CSC 301: INTRODUCTION TO SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

SPRINT 2 (PRELIMINARY SUBMISSION) GRADING RUBRIC

The assignment is graded out of 100. Final scores are rounded to the nearest whole point.

Method of score computation:

For each element a rating is assigned based on the rubric. Each rating has an associated point value: Excellent 100, Good 75, Adequate 65, Marginal 50, and Inadequate 0.

The scores for the elements are combined according to their respective weights to reach an overall score for the assignment (out of 100). The assignment grade is that overall score rounded to the nearest point.

SPRINT BACKLOG (SPRINT PLANNING) [25% OF TOTAL]

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate
-User stories that have been broken down into tasks for this sprint are clearly indicated -Tasks incorporate all required work -Tasks are of suitable size -Tasks estimated and tasks estimates are reasonable and consistent relative to other tasks -Task estimates in hours -Sprint planning meeting well-documented in the meeting minutes	-User stories that have been broken down into tasks for this sprint are clearly indicated -Tasks incorporate all required work -Tasks are of reasonable size, but could be further decomposed -Tasks estimated and tasks estimates are reasonable and largely consistent relative to other tasks -Task estimates in hours -Sprint planning meeting documented in the meeting minutes	-User stories that have been broken down into tasks for this sprint are indicated or can be inferred from context -Tasks cover most required work -Tasks may span more than a few days work -Tasks would benefit from further decomposition -Tasks estimated and tasks estimates are generally reasonable -Task estimates in hours -Sprint planning meeting documented in meeting meetings	-Tasks relate to user stories, but the correspondence between may not be clear -Tasks cover only some required work -Tasks may be excessively coarse -Tasks estimates are provided but may be unreasonably or inconsistent with other tasks -Task estimated are provided but may not be in hours -Documentation of sprint planning meeting may be lacking	-Little evidence of proper task construction -Task estimates may not be provided -Tasks if present may be highly coarse

SCRUM BOARD [15% OF TOTAL]

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate
-Scrum board consistently used to track and monitor tasks/stories -Scrum board assigns all tasks to group members	-Scrum board usually used to track and monitor tasks/stories-Scrum board assigns most tasks to group members	-Scrum board sometimes used to track and monitor tasks/stories -Scrum board assigns some tasks to group members	-Scrum board rarely used to track and monitor tasks/stories -Tasks often not assigned to specified group members	-Scrum board not used to track and monitor tasks/stories

BURN DOWN CHART [10% OF TOTAL]

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate
-Chart includes planned work and actual work, each clearly labelled -All axes labelled and -Scale uses appropriate units and units are clearly indicated -Chart is professionally presented and easy to interpret -Estimated and actual velocity calculated	-Chart shows planned work and actual work, however labelling may be unclear -Axes may be missing labels -Scale uses appropriate units; units are indicated or may be inferred from context -May be some minor issues with chart readability or presentation -Estimated and actual velocity calculated	-Chart shows planned work and actual work which may be distinguished from context, but are unlabelled -Axes may be missing labels -Scale may have some issues with interpretability -May be issues with chart readability or presentation -Estimated and actual velocity, but one or both may have a computation issue	-Planned work and/or actual work series are not clearly distinguished; one or more series may be missing entirely -Axes may be missing labels -Scales may not be indicated or are marked incorrectly -Chart has significant issues with readability or presentation -One or both of estimated and actual velocity may be omitted	-Burn down chart is not produced or fails to include required elements -Chart has issues with readability or presentation that cause it to be difficult or impossible to interpret

TESTS [50% OF TOTAL]

The appropriate table will be used for automation test and manual test. In the case of a mix both, an overall testing rating is assigned by considering both the automation and manual test tables. In addition, regardless of the method of testing, testing process will always be considered.

Testing process

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate
-Tests provided for all user stories and the correspondence between tests to user stories is clearly delineated in the tests / test plans directly or in external documentation -Automated testing is favoured; use of manual testing is limited to scenarios difficult (from an engineering perspective) to automate and justification for the decision to manual test those scenarios is provided	-Tests provided for all user stories and the correspondence between tests to user stories is clearly delineated in the tests / test plans directly or in external documentation -Automated testing is generally favoured, use of manual testing is largely limited to scenarios difficult (from an engineering perspective) to automate, however use of manual testing is not fully justified	-Tests provided for all user stories however the correspondence between tests and user stories is not clearly outlined in either the tests or external documentation -While some tests may be automated, manual testing is broadly employed even in scenarios technically amenable (from an engineering perspective) to automation	-Tests provided for most user stories -Correspondence between tests and user stories may be unclear -While some tests may be automated, manual testing is broadly employed even in scenarios technically amenable (from an engineering perspective) to automation	-Tests not provided for many user stories

Automation Test

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate
-Demonstrates a mastery of unit and integration testing -Uses a test suite -All methods and classes covered -Integration tests are included for all related components -Complete positive and negative tests cases for all methods present -Boundary conditions considered and checked -Tests include all input conditions and return values -Tests include those for errors and exceptions	-Demonstrates skill with unit and integration testing -Uses a test suite -All methods and classes are covered with rare exceptions -Integration tests are included for most related components -Positive and negative tests cases for all methods present -Tests case sets or boundary condition testing be inconsistent -Tests include most input conditions and return values -Some error conditions may be untested	-Demonstrates an understanding of unit and integration testing concepts -Uses a test suite -Most methods and classes are covered -Integration tests are included for some related components -Some positive and negative tests case sets may be lacking -Boundary conditions often remain untested -Tests include some input conditions and return values -Error testing is lacking	-Demonstrates some familiarity with unit and integration testing concepts -Uses a test suite -Numerous methods may remain and classes untested -Little or no integration testing -Tests fail to address many scenarios and boundary conditions -Only basic input conditions and return values tested -No testing for errors	-Unit and integration tests added are inadequate; numerous expected tests are omitted -No test suite -Tests are very sparse -Expected results may be invalid or incorrect -No demonstration of a clear strategy for testing

Manual Test

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate
-Demonstrates a mastery of thorough manual testing -Uses a written test plan that thoroughly explains all steps and expected results at each stage -Complete positive and negative tests cases for all user interface -Tests include all input conditions and expected results -Tests include those for error conditions	-Demonstrates skill with thorough manual testing -Uses a written test plan that includes all steps and most expected results -Positive and negative tests cases for all user interface -Tests include most input conditions and expected results -Some error conditions may be untested	-Demonstrates an understanding of thorough manual testing concepts -Uses a written test plan that includes all steps; may omit some expected results at interim stages -Most methods and classes are covered -Some positive and negative tests case sets may be lacking -Tests include some input conditions and expected results -Error testing is lacking	-Demonstrates some familiarity with thorough manual testing concepts -Uses a written test plan -Numerous methods may remain and classes untested -Only basic input conditions and expected results tested -No testing for errors	-Thorough manual tests added are inadequate; numerous expected tests are omitted -No written test plan -Tests are very sparse -Expected results may be invalid or incorrect -No demonstration of a clear strategy for testing