

SPA II: Assessment Criteria

#	Aspect	Consider
1	Language and Writing	Flow and top-down structuring (to present information to reader in logical order), spelling and grammar, clarity and appropriateness of expression, correct use of terminology (no slang!)
	Section: Case Projects	
2	Project characteristics relevant to SPM.	How are the fictive case projects for Application Development and Software Porting described; clear and relevant information provided? Is there sufficient information concerning SPM needs for each project type to follow the recommendations and discussions in Section "Tool Recommendation"?
	Section: Evaluation framework	
3	- Evaluation factors	How well does the framework cover the SPM needs described in the Case Projects section? Do the factors cover needs for both agile and traditional SPM?
4	- Evaluation factors	Are the definitions of the evaluated factors (measurements) clear and unambiguous or is there a risk of interpreting them differently?
5	- Measurement scales	The scales designed for each measurement. Are they clearly and appropriately defined considering validity (subjective vs objective) and strength (type of scale, e.g. nominal, interval, ordinal, ratio)?
6	- Main report vs appendix	Consider the description of the evaluation framework here vs in the appendix. Is the description in the main report sufficiently detailed to grasp which factors that are evaluated and how this is done? (Note: Info in the appendix is not included in the formal assessment/grading.)
	Section: Tool Evaluation and Improvements	
7	- Reporting of evaluation results	Consider how the results of applying the framework (i.e. the measurements) are presented: stand-alone (potentially repetitive) or integrated with framework description? How easy is it to gain an overview overall, per tool and for individual SPM areas?
8	- Tool improvement suggestions	Consider the descriptions of improvement suggestions. How are they related to a) the description of the affected SPM sub-areas (provided in the Introduction section), and b) the existing SPM support of the tool?
	Section: Tool recommendation per Project type	
9	- Analysis of evaluation results	Consider the analysis per project type. How clearly is the discussion connected to a) the outcome of the evaluation measurements (in Section Tool Evaluation) and b) to the SPM needs of the case projects (presented in Section Case Projects)? Is more background information needed to follow the discussion (i.e. should Section Case Projects be extended)?
10	- Recommendations	Consider the tool recommendation given per project type. How are pros and cons balanced in the recommendation? How easy is it to see/understand motivation for these based on the evaluation results (Section Tool Evaluation) and the case project needs (Section Case Projects)?
	Section: Conclusion	
11	Presentation and writing	Consider structure and content. Is the niche (from Introduction) revisited? How well and at which level of detail is the "filling of the niche" described? Can someone who has only read the Abstract and Introduction follow the Conclusion section?