	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Addressing Feedback	• Ignores feedback • Issues not tracked	• Some addressed • Incorrectly addressed • Inconsistent • Issues not tracked	• Mostly addressed • Mostly well addressed • Mostly consistent • Issues somewhat tracked	• All addressed • Well addressed • Consistent • Issues tracked
OOAD	• Failure to demonstrate OOAD • Poor diagrams	• Somewhat OO, but poor design decisions • Unclear separation of concerns • Little information hiding • Missing classes and interfaces • Missing important elements • Includes unimportant elements • Inconsistent diagrams • Incorrect notation	• Mostly OO • Mostly separates concerns • Some information hiding • Mostly clear classes and interfaces • Most important elements described • Mostly consistent diagrams • Mostly correct notation • Like Excellent, but lacking in some aspect	• Clearly OO • Properly separates concerns • Good information hiding • Clear classes and interfaces • Important elements described • Consistent diagrams • Correct notation • Boundary, control, and entity layering in architecture • Understandable design rationale and helpful commentary • Neatly laid out and labeled diagrams
Unit Testing	• No unit tests	• Missing unit tests or tests cannot run • Unconvincing testing • Inconsistent • Tests do not check against expectations • Not using JUnit • Often testing existing Java collections or features	• Unit tests exist and can run • Mostly convincing testing • Mostly complete unit tests of entity (model) classes • Mostly consistent • Realistic test data • Like Excellent, but lacking in some aspect	• Unit tests exist and can run • Convincing testing for anticipated implementation • Comprehensive unit tests of entity (model) classes • Consistent • Realistic test data • Stubs exist for unimplemented methods • Methods match design
Tool Practices	• Limited use (e.g., Dropbox, emailing zips)	• Inconsistent/infrequent use	• Inconsistent, but frequent use among team	• Team members commit to Git/Wiki regularly
Individual Task and Peer Review Forms	• Less than a few members completed forms	• A few members completed forms	• All but one member completed forms	• All members completed forms

Addressing Feedback: U=-1.5, S=-1, G=-0.5, E=0

OOAD: U=0, S=1, G=2, E=3

Unit Testing: U/S=0, G=0.5, E=1

Tool Practices: U=-1.5, S=-1, G=-0.5, E=0

Forms: U=-1.5, S=-1, G=-0.5, E=0

floor = 0, ceiling = 4

When in doubt:

Descriptor	Interpretation
Excellent	Consistently original thinking that extends the material, demonstrated depth and breadth in the material, ability to integrate material with other subjects, ability to analyse and synthesize material at various levels of abstraction.
Good	Like an A, but not consistent over time, or weak in a specific area.
Satisfactory	Understand the core material but not its subtleties, can apply it to simple situations on own and to more complex situations with hints, evidence that the material has changed the way of thinking.
Unsatisfactory	Understand some of the core material but not its subtleties, can apply it to simple situations but often needs assistance, evidence that the material has had some change on the way of thinking.
Unsatisfactory	Shows some understanding of parts of the material, cannot apply it without some direction, little evidence that the material has changed the way of thinking.
Unsatisfactory	Little evidence of understanding of even the surface issues, poor analysis and synthesis, inability to apply the material.