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1 Introduction

This document contains the evaluation criteria for the practical test for the Certified Professional for Usability and User Experience – Advanced Level "User requirements Engineering" (CPUX-UR). The evaluation criteria are used by the examiner to assess the responses in the practical test taken by candidates who wish to receive CPUX-UR certification. This document can also be used to explain to parties with an interest in the exam how their CPUX-UR test responses are evaluated.

Further information about the testing procedure for CPUX-UR is available in the document "Test regulations CPUX-UR", see www.uxqb.org.

2 Legend

The tables on the following pages describe the evaluation criteria and the allocation of points for each assessment criterion for each task in the practical test. The examiner enters the examinee's score and a comment about it in the last column.
3 Initial check of the delivered responses

With the initial check, the examiner determines whether the candidate has provided all the necessary examination responses. The initial check does not include the making of an evaluation. If one of the following user needs for the examination responses is not met, the examiner should first decide whether a further evaluation of the test responses is actually meaningful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Examiner comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0a</td>
<td>Has the table in section 3.4 been supplemented with the as-is scenario for the non-documented interview question?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0b</td>
<td>Have user groups been entered in the table in section 3.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0c</td>
<td>Have user needs been entered in the table in section 3.6?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0d</td>
<td>Have user requirements been entered in the table in section 3.6?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0e</td>
<td>Has a task with preconditions, postconditions, sub-tasks and associated user requirements been entered in the table in section 3.7?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0f</td>
<td>Have behavioural errors on the part of the interviewer been entered in the table in section 3.8?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4  Report on the as-is scenario for a question in a contextual interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Assessment criterion</th>
<th>Allocation of points</th>
<th>Comment/result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1a | Has the as-is scenario from the contextual interview (for the question in the interview checklist) been completed in full? | Up to 1/3 of the text, 1 point  
Up to 2/3 of the text, 2 points  
Up to 3/3 of the text, 3 points | For each description that has not come from users, deduction of 1 point |
| 1b | Has only context information actually provided by the user been included, without the addition of artificially constructed information? | For each description that has not come from users, deduction of 1 point | |

5  User groups identified in the as-is scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Assessment criterion</th>
<th>Allocation of points</th>
<th>Comment/result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Have all the user groups that exist in the social environment of the interviewed user been mentioned?</td>
<td>For each user group, 3 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 6 User needs identified in the as-is scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Assessment criterion</th>
<th>Allocation of points</th>
<th>Comment/result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Has the minimum number of user needs been correctly identified and formulated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For each applicable user need (a maximum of 10 user needs are counted),</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>For each non-applicable user need (EACH non-applicable user need is counted),</td>
<td>3 point deduction (not below 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>Does each user need consist of a prerequisite and the goal that is thereby achievable?</td>
<td></td>
<td>For each deviation, 1 point deduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Is the prerequisite a condition in the form of &quot;know something&quot; or have something&quot; or &quot;be able to do&quot; something&quot; in each case?</td>
<td></td>
<td>For each deviation, 1 point deduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>Is the goal formulated in the form of an activity or decision in each case?</td>
<td></td>
<td>For each deviation, 1 point deduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Are there any additional user needs that can be given points?</td>
<td></td>
<td>For each valid and correctly formulated additional user need, 1 point, maximum 3 points For each non-valid or incorrectly formulated additional user need, deduction of 1 point, minimum 0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanations:

- The as-is scenario contains a large number of identifiable user needs. In order to achieve the maximum number of 30 points in this examination task, at least TEN valid user needs must be identified and correctly formulated.
  - A user need is valid if it can be derived from the as-is scenario and is not based on other assumptions and if it is not redundant because of another already identified user need.
  - Each valid and correctly formulated user need is given THREE points, invalid user needs are given ZERO points.
  - There is a deduction of ONE point for each user need that is not formulated correctly, i.e. if it is not formulated as (1) purpose and prerequisite or (2) the prerequisite and/or (3) the goal is/are not formulated using the applicable syntax.
  - No user need can be allocated less than ZERO points
- The TEN user needs to be used for the evaluation by the examiner must be marked with a double underline of the number of the respective user need, e.g. N3
- Further user needs identified can be allocated a maximum of THREE additional points.
  - Each further valid and correctly formulated user need is given a point. Non-valid or incorrectly formulated further user needs are given a minus point.
  - In total, no more than THREE additional points can be allocated and no less than ZERO additional points.
  - Example:
    a. 4 further user needs (of which 3 valid and correct) = 3-1=TWO additional points
    b. 4 further user needs (of which 1 valid and correct) = 1-3=ZERO additional points
    c. 5 further user needs (of which 5 valid and correct) = 5=THREE additional points
    d. 10 further user needs (of which 6 valid and correct) = 6-4=TWO additional points
## 7 User requirements derived in the as-is scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Assessment criterion</th>
<th>Allocation of points</th>
<th>Comment/result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Have all the user requirements been derived?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>For each applicable user requirement (maximum of 13 are counted),</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>For each non-applicable user requirement (EACH non-applicable user requirement is counted),</td>
<td>3 point deduction (not below 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>Does each user requirement describe what the user must be able to recognise or select or enter in the system?</td>
<td>For each deviation, 1 point deduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>Is the respective user requirement not immunised? (EACH immunised user requirement is counted)</td>
<td>3 point deduction (not below 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td>Are there any additional user requirements that can be given points?</td>
<td>For each valid and correctly formulated and not immunised additional user requirement, 1 point, maximum 3 points For each invalid, incorrectly formulated or immunised additional user requirement 1 point deduction, minimum 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanations:

- A minimum of 13 user requirements can be derived from the user needs identified in the as-is scenario. In order to achieve the maximum score in this examination task, you must derive and correctly formulate at least THIRTEEN valid user requirements.
  - A user requirement is valid if it is derived correctly from user needs and is not redundant because of another already formulated user requirement.
  - Each valid and correctly formulated user requirement is given THREE points, invalid user requirements are given ZERO points.
  - There is a ONE point deduction for each user requirement that has not been formulated correctly, i.e. if the user requirement
    - does not describe what the user has to recognise/select/enter in the system or
    - is not correctly formulated pursuant to the syntax rules.
  - There is a THREE point deduction for each user requirement that is immunised.
  - No user requirement can be allocated less than ZERO points.

- The THIRTEEN user requirements to be used for the evaluation by the examiner must be marked with a double underline of the number of the respective user requirement, e. B. UR5.

- Further user requirements derived can be allocated a maximum of THREE additional points.
  - Each further valid, correctly formulated and non-immunised user requirement is given a point.
  - Non-valid, incorrectly formulated or immunised further user requirements are given a minus point.
  - In total, no more than THREE additional points can be allocated and no less than ZERO additional points.
8 User requirements structured by sub-tasks within a task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Assessment criterion</th>
<th>Allocation of points</th>
<th>Comment/result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the task that is to be supported been appropriately named in the form of an activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Title of the task in the form of an activity</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>1 point deduction, if inappropriately named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Has (have) the precondition(s) that form(s) the basis for this task been named appropriately?</td>
<td>½ point deduction, if inappropriately named (not less than 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Has (have) the postcondition(s) that form(s) the basis for this task been named appropriately?</td>
<td>½ point deduction, if inappropriately named (not less than 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d</td>
<td>Have the sub-tasks been specified completely?</td>
<td>1 point for each suitable sub-task</td>
<td>1 point deduction for each unsuitable sub-task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e</td>
<td>Has each user requirement been allocated to the relevant sub-task(s)?</td>
<td>1 point for each appropriately allocated user requirement</td>
<td>1 point deduction for each inappropriately allocated user requirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9 Behavioural errors on the part of the interviewer identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Assessment criterion</th>
<th>Allocation of points</th>
<th>Comment/result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Have relevant methodological errors committed by the interviewer during the contextual interview been identified? (Maximum 4 errors are counted)</td>
<td>1 point for each methodological error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>