

Understanding CMMI Measurement Capabilities & Impact on Performance: Results from the 2007 SEI State of the Measurement Practice Survey

Dennis R. Goldenson
Software Engineering Institute

CMMI Technology Conference
14 November 2007



Today's Talk

Purpose & scope of the survey

Results

- The respondents & their organizations
- Measurement resources & infrastructure
- Value added by measurement
- Software measures used
- Data quality & integrity
- Organizational perspectives on software measurement

Summary, lessons learned & next steps



Understanding the State of Measurement Practice

Careful & well executed use of measurement & analysis

- Is a well accepted tenet in many fields of endeavor
- Including of course CMMI

Basic aims

- To inform management & technical decisions based on empirical evidence
- & to judge the results of those decisions once made

But, how well, and how frequently, are measurement practices put into effect in our own field?



Surveys & Benchmarking

Benchmarking: The current state

- Some professional & consulting organizations maintain repositories they use for establishing benchmarks & facilitating benchmarking activities
- However, their measures & measurement definitions differ in many ways
- In that sense, one cannot speak confidently about “industry standards”
- Which is why the SEI has launched the Performance Benchmarking Consortium {as described at last year’s CMMI Technology Conference}

The state of the practice surveys

- Aim to provide data that's not yet widely available
 - Updates of trends in typical use of measurement in software & systems engineering
 - To help projects & organizations judge their progress relative to others
- But there **also** will be a continuing need to track qualitative as well as quantitative descriptions about the quality & frequency of use of measurement in our field



2nd Annual SEI Measurement Practice Survey

New this year

- Screening question to identify respondents whose organizations develop software but rarely if ever do measurement
- Questions about
 - Resources & infrastructure devoted to measurement
 - Practices to ensure data quality & integrity
 - Value added by doing measurement
 - The kinds of measures used by the responding organizations

Among other things, these questions allow us to make some useful comparisons by CMMI maturity level



Trends over Time

1st survey described at last year's CMMI technology Conference

Similar results this year

- Moderately strong relationships exist when comparing the replies of respondents based on:
 - Management versus staff roles
 - Industry *versus* government organizations
 - The United States *versus* other countries
 - Organization size

But that's a topic for another time



CMMI Measurement Capabilities & Performance Outcomes

Today's focus

- Provide evidence about the circumstances under which measurement capabilities and performance outcomes are likely to vary
- As a consequence of achieving higher levels of CMMI maturity

Most differences **are** consistent with expectations based on CMMI

- Which provides confidence in the validity of the model structure & content

However, the results also highlight areas where sometimes considerable room for improvement remains

- Even at maturity levels 4 and 5
- For example
 - A rather strong overall relationship exists between maturity level & use of measures about quality attributes
 - Little attention to quality attributes at the lower maturity levels
 - Yet, almost half of maturity level 4 & 5 respondents' organizations track quality attributes only occasionally at best



The Sample

Random sample of SEI customers

- 944 valid email invitations to participate

Data collected 20 February through 10 April 2007

- Two reminders

Response rate

- 41% completed all or part of the questionnaire
- N = 384
- Individual questions answered by 75-97% of respondents
 - ~29 – 39% of the sample invitees



Today's Talk

Purpose & scope of the survey


Results

- **The respondents & their organizations**
- Measurement resources & infrastructure
- Value added by measurement
- Software measures used
- Data quality & integrity
- Organizational perspectives on software measurement

Summary, lessons learned & next steps



Role in the Organization




N = 366



Who are the others?

= 8% of all those responding



N = 155




And who are the other others?


Process + Measurement	3	} 6	One each: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Administrative support• Coach• Consultant + researcher• Engineering Manager + Process• Process + Project engineer• Program / team lead• Program manager + Quality + Process• Project manager + Quality• Project manager + Engineer• Not specified
Measurement Specialist	1		
Process + Quality + Measurement + Training	1		
Quality + Process + Measurement	1		
Training	6		
Architect	4		
Security	2		
Testing	2		
N = 31			



Sector



Country




N = 363



FTE Staff

Percent




N = 364



Maturity level


Percent




N = 365



Differences by Maturity Level: Use of Measurement in the Organization



Interpreting the results: The Respondents' Measurement Roles



p = .04



Today's Talk

Purpose & scope of the survey


Results

- The respondents & their organizations
- **Measurement resources & infrastructure**
- Value added by measurement
- Software measures used
- Data quality & integrity
- Organizational perspectives on software measurement


Summary, lessons learned & next steps



How Measurement Work is Staffed




Earmarked Budgets for Measurement



$p < .0001$



Availability of Qualified Measurement Staff



Similar Results

For:

- Automated measurement support for data collection, data management, data analysis & reporting
- Use of commercial measurement packages & tools
- Existence of common, integrated organizational measurement repositories
- Availability of measurement related training

Proportions sometimes vary across the distributions.

But there are consistent differences by maturity level.



Today's Talk

Purpose & scope of the survey

Results


- The respondents & their organizations
- Measurement resources & infrastructure
- **Value added by measurement**
- Software measures used
- Data quality & integrity
- Organizational perspectives on software measurement

Summary, lessons learned & next steps



Effects of Measurement on the Organizations₁


Better Project Performance



ML1&DK N = 74 ML2 N = 60 ML3 N = 50 ML4&5 N = 56

Gamma = .41 p < .0001

Better Product Quality




ML1&DK N = 74 ML2 N = 60 ML3 N = 50 ML4&5 N = 56

Gamma = .34 p < .0002




Effects of Measurement on the Organizations₂

Better Tactical Decisions



Gamma = .35 p = .0001

Better Strategic Decisions



Gamma = .31 p = .0008



Today's Talk

Purpose & scope of the survey

Results


- The respondents & their organizations
- Measurement resources & infrastructure
- Value added by measurement
- **Software measures used**
- Data quality & integrity
- Organizational perspectives on software measurement

Summary, lessons learned & next steps



Project & Organizational Measurement Results Reported₁


Cost Performance



Gamma = .25

p < .03

Schedule Performance




Gamma = .37

p = .0006



Project & Organizational Measurement Results Reported₂

Business Growth & Profitability




Gamma = .20 p = .2244





Product & Quality Measurement Results Reported₁

Requirements / Architectures



Gamma = .37 p = .0002

Quality Attributes




Gamma = .32 p < .008





Product & Quality Measurement Results Reported₂

Defect Density



Gamma = .41 p < .0001

Defect Phase Containment




Gamma = .44 p < .0001



Product & Quality Measurement Results Reported₃

Customer Satisfaction



Similar Results

For:

- Adherence to work processes
- Effort applied to task
- Estimation accuracy
- Cycle time

Proportions sometimes vary across the distributions.

But there are consistent differences by maturity level.



Today's Talk

Purpose & scope of the survey

Results


- The respondents & their organizations
- Measurement resources & infrastructure
- Value added by measurement
- Software measures used
- **Data quality & integrity**
- Organizational perspectives on software measurement

Summary, lessons learned & next steps




Differences by Maturity Level: Practices to Ensure Data Quality

Statistical estimates of measurement error



Gamma = .44 p < .0001

Checks for inconsistent interpretation




Gamma = .44 p < .0001



Differences by Maturity Level: Practices to Ensure Data Quality

Checks for unusual distribution patterns



Gamma = .46 p < .0001



Similar Results

For:

- Out of range & illegal values ... Number & distribution of missing data
- Missing data not treated as zero ... Precision & accuracy tests
- Other aspects of alignment & coordination of measurement activities
 - Understandable & consistent measurement definitions
 - Understandable & interpretable measurement results
 - Use of “standard” measurement methods
 - Measurable product & service criteria
 - Measurement used to understand product & service quality
 - Documented data collection process
 - Documented process for reporting results
 - Corrective action taken when thresholds exceeded
 - Understands purposes of the data collected/reported

Proportions sometimes vary across the distributions.

But there are consistent differences by maturity level.



Today's Talk

Purpose & scope of the survey

Results


- The respondents & their organizations
- Measurement resources & infrastructure
- Value added by measurement
- Software measures used
- Data quality & integrity
- **Organizational perspectives on software measurement**

Summary, lessons learned & next steps




Organizational Perspectives

Not Relevant for Decision Making



Onerous or Burdensome



Similar Results

For:

- Stated negatively
 - Inappropriate collection & use of data
 - Resistance to “extra” work
- Stated positively
 - Understandable & interpretable results
 - Data collected are regularly analyzed
 - Measurement an integral part of the business
 - Objective results highly valued

Once again:

- Proportions sometimes vary across the distributions.
- But there are consistent differences by maturity level.

Yet resistance to measurement still exists in our field.

- Even in high maturity organizations



Today's Talk

Purpose & scope of the survey

Results

- The respondents & their organizations
- Measurement resources & infrastructure
- Value added by measurement
- Software measures used
- Data quality & integrity
- Organizational perspectives on software measurement

Summary, lessons learned & next steps



Summary of Results

Characteristic differences associated with CMMI Maturity level achieved

- Measurement capability & performance outcomes
- Common stair step pattern up the maturity levels
- Some quite substantial

Still, some of the results imply room for improvement

- Sometimes substantial room

Even in higher maturity organizations

- Although the expectations for quality & “goodness” may well be higher there too
- Jim Herbsleb & I saw a similar pattern years ago
 - For process champions *versus* practitioners & managers



The Future

Relatively little data yet exist for meaningful comparisons among software & systems engineering projects & organizations

- Hence tendency to cover too much at once in a single sample survey

Considering variants on matrix sampling strategies for 2008 survey

- Answer only a subset of questions ... to avoid over-burdening the respondents

“State of the practice” can refer to very different target populations

- The SEI customer base ... the broader software & systems engineering community ... or those organizations that more routinely use measurement?
- Of course, the answer depends on the purposes of the survey



Next Steps

Our plans

- We will track change over time & go into further depth about focused topics from the perspective of current measurement practitioners

Considering parallel samples for 2008

- A short set of questions for tracking the diffusion of measurement through the broader software & systems engineering community
- Possible focus on issues faced with respect to the adoption & use of high maturity measurement practices

Also fielding a survey on Program Office acquisition capabilities (early 2008)

Of course, there is no shortage of additional topics for the future

- In the SEI series or in those that we hope to see done by others



Thank You for Your Attention!

Dennis R. Goldenson
dg@sei.cmu.edu

Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
USA



Software Engineering Institute

Carnegie Mellon



Software Engineering Institute

Carnegie Mellon