

Rubric Prog 5/6 v1.2 - Oct 2023 - Roomba

Proficiency level:	Advanced	Proficient	Emerging	Novice
Analysis	All of the requirements of the Roomba project were realized.	Most of the requirements of the Roomba project were realized.	Some of the requirements of the Roomba project were realized.	None of the requirements of the Roomba project were realized.
Requirements	<i>SMART Requirements. Both FURPS+ and MoSCoW were used perfectly.</i>	<i>Somewhat SMART Requirements. Both FURPS+ and MoSCoW were used to some degree.</i>	<i>Requirement could be much more SMART . FURPS+/MoSCoW were used but not very well.</i>	<i>Nothing SMART. No FURPS+ and/or MoSCoW.</i>
Design	<i>There was a solid design that helped to turn the problem into a proof-of-concept.</i>	<i>Overall design was good, some details could have been better, it was a solid starting point for the proof-of-concept.</i>	<i>The design could have been better but there was a basic design that incorporates key elements.</i>	<i>There was no design at all or the design lacked key elements needed for successful implementation.</i>
Functional	<i>The use cases themselves and their explanation are clear cut.</i>	<i>There are still a few issues with the use cases and their explanation.</i>	<i>There are still a lot of issues with the use cases and their explanation.</i>	<i>No use cases and/or no elaboration.</i>
Technical	<i>At least three types (e.g. Class, Sequence, States) of technical designs were used and they were flawless.</i>	<i>At least two types technical designs were used.</i>	<i>There was at least one technical design and/ or it/they still had problems.</i>	<i>No adequate technical designs used.</i>
Realization: Proof-of-Concept	<i>Problem was turned into a working proof-of-concept (PoC) that worked well and helped to prove the case.</i>	<i>Working example was created, it still had some issues but the overall proof-of-concept was successful.</i>	<i>There was a basic solution for the problem, but it did not work well.</i>	<i>There was no working proof-of-concept at all or it was not relevant for the problem.</i>
Application of OO principles	<i>Classes, encapsulation, inheritance, abstract classes and/ or the principle of interface were used to perfection.</i>	<i>More advanced OO principles were applied.</i>	<i>The basic OO principles were applied.</i>	<i>No OO principles were applied.</i>
Good programming: SOLID / DRY / KISS	<i>Both details and overall process were managed very well.</i>	<i>Details and overall process were managed well, but could still improve.</i>	<i>Process like a bumpy road, but at least good efforts were made to reach the end.</i>	<i>Utter chaos.</i>
Reflection on your work	<i>A solid advice was given based on analysis (use-case), PoC. This was translated into a convincing presentation / report / video.</i>	<i>Given advice was sufficient, but there were still holes in argumentation.</i>	<i>The presented advice was not really based on use-case and/or PoC and/or not convincing at all.</i>	<i>There was no advice.</i>
Professionalization: personal level	<i>Perfect performance. Great communication.</i>	<i>Good performance, reasonable communication.</i>	<i>Okay performance, communication should have been better.</i>	<i>Lack in performance, communication is poor.</i>
	Teacher name:	Date:		
	Name:	ID:		Final mark:
Student:				