

Elicitation Rubric

Student(s)/Work:.....

Reviewed by:.....

Criteria	4 – Superior Command	3 – Good Control	2 – Fair/Some Control	1 – Minimal or No Control
----------	----------------------	------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

There is no proper Rubric for this assignment. Rather, the following list of Do's and Don'ts in an Interview Situation is used to assess your performance:

- Do prepare thoroughly for the meeting
- Do prepare a checklist for the meeting
- Do introduce yourself properly
- Do ask about access to stakeholders
- Do ask about access to previous systems
- Do book the next meeting
- Do ask about quality requirements
- Do make sure you know who you are talking to, and why
- Do ask about deadlines

- Don't put your laptop on the table as a wall between you and your client
- Don't keep your cap on your head
- Don't interrupt the customer
- Don't interrupt each other
- Don't take no notes
- Don't record the interview without asking
- Don't assume stuff
- Don't provide requirements
- Don't provide goldplating
- Don't technobabble
- Don't sit quiet
- Don't kiss up (too much)
- Don't follow your meeting checklist manically
- Don't share war-stories about other customers and systems
- Don't ask about the budget at the first meeting
- Don't argue among yourselves

Rubric created September 17, 2010.

Requirements Engineering, Elicitation Rubric (ER) version 1.0, 2010-09-16, M. Svahnberg, R. Feldt

Specification Rubric

Student(s)/Work:.....

Reviewed by:.....

Criteria	4 – Superior Command	3 – Good Control	2 – Fair/Some Control	1 – Minimal or No Control
Language Spelling, Wording, Grammar, Sentence Structure, Paragraph Structure, Flow, Voice	There are no errors that impair the flow of communication. (Perfect with < 2 errors)	Occasional errors that have only minor impact on the flow of communication. (A few minor errors)	Frequent errors that impede the flow of communication. (A few more serious errors)	Errors are serious and numerous. Reader must stop and reread and many struggle to discern the authors meaning. (Multiple, serious errors)
Formalia Format, Layout, Style & Length	All required formal information is present and correct. Follows the IEEE 830 structure, format, layout and style.	All required formal information is present but something is unclear. A few minor deviances from the proposed structure, format, layout and style.	Some formal information is missing. Several deviances from the proposed structure, format, layout and style.	Several pieces of the formal information is missing. Major and multiple deviances from the proposed structure, format, layout and style.
Coverage Coverage of what was said during the elicitation meeting	Everything said during the elicitation meeting is covered by the requirements and with the elicitation meeting as source.	Most of what was said during the elicitation meeting is covered by the requirements and with the elicitation meeting as source. The rest is covered by requirements that are identified as assumptions.	Most of what was said during the elicitation meeting is covered by the requirements, but the source is unclear. There are some gaps where information given during the elicitation meeting is not covered.	Some of what was said during the elicitation meeting is covered by the requirements, but the source is unclear. There are obvious gaps where information given during the elicitation meeting is not covered.
Requirements' Structure Overall structure of the individual requirements (or instances of the specific specification technique used (when not NatLang))	All requirements have the right attributes and information, properly filled in. The actual requirement (technique instance) are written in a standard format.	All requirements have the right attributes/information filled in. Some of the attributes/information are sometimes not fully used/specified. The actual requirement (technique instance) are written in a standard format.	All requirements have the right attributes/information. Some of the attributes/information are not used/specified.	Requirements lack some attributes/information. Some of the attributes/information are not used/specified. The requirements (technique instance) are written ad-hoc.
Requirements' Specification Well-formedness of the individual requirements (or instances of the specific specification technique used (when not NatLang))	All requirements (technique instances) are complete, unambiguous, consistent, testable and clearly conveys what the system is supposed to do.	Requirements (technique instances) are mostly complete, unambiguous, consistent, testable and conveys what the system is supposed to do, but there are some deviations.	Many requirements (technique instances) are incomplete, ambiguous, inconsistent, untestable or does not convey what the system is supposed to do.	There is no structure to the requirements (technique instances) at all, and many requirements fail on more than one of the quality criteria (complete, unambiguous, consistent, testable and conveys what the system is supposed to do)
Specification Overall Impression of the Requirements Specification	The requirements are logically ordered, and all sections of the document are filled with relevant and complete information.	The requirements are mostly logically ordered, and most sections of the document are filled with relevant and complete information.	The requirements are mostly logically ordered. Some sections of the document are not filled with relevant or complete information.	The requirements are not logically ordered, which makes it difficult to understand the what the system is supposed to do.

Rubric created September 17, 2010. Requirements Engineering, Specification Rubric (SR) version 1.0, 2010-09-16, M. Svahnberg, R. Feldt

Prioritisation Rubric

Student(s)/Work:.....

Reviewed by:.....

Criteria	4 – Superior Command	3 – Good Control	2 – Fair/Some Control	1 – Minimal or No Control
Language Spelling, Wording, Grammar, Sentence Structure, Paragraph Structure, Flow, Voice	There are no errors that impair the flow of communication. (Perfect with < 2 errors)	Occasional errors that have only minor impact on the flow of communication. (A few minor errors)	Frequent errors that impede the flow of communication. (A few more serious errors)	Errors are serious and numerous. Reader must stop and reread and many struggle to discern the authors meaning. (Multiple, serious errors)
Prioritisation Strategy Choice and motivation of method for prioritising requirements	The choice of prioritisation method is clearly motivated. Alternatives are discussed, along with reasons for not using them.	The choice of prioritisation method is motivated. Alternatives are discussed.	The choice of prioritisation method is motivated.	The choice of prioritisation method is not motivated.
Prioritisation Execution Control of chosen prioritisation method.	The chosen prioritisation method is well executed without any errors. The execution is well documented.	The chosen prioritisation method is well executed with only a few errors. The execution is documented.	The chosen prioritisation method appears to be reasonably well executed, but there is insufficient documentation to fully assess this.	There are obvious mistakes done while executing the chosen prioritisation method. There is little or no documentation of the execution.
Release Plan Viability of the developed release plan.	Each release package presents a workable software solution. The release plan logically follows from the conducted prioritisation. Deviations are well motivated.	Each release package presents a workable software solution, but some requirements should be done in another release. The release plan logically follows from the conducted prioritisation, but there are some undocumented deviations.	It is unclear whether each release package presents a workable software solution. It is unclear whether the release plan actually follows from the conducted prioritisation.	The release packages do not present a workable software solution. There is no connection between the conducted prioritisation and the release packages.

Rubric created September 17, 2010.

Requirements Engineering, Prioritisation Rubric (PR) version 1.0, 2010-09-16, M. Svahnberg, R. Feldt