

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
<b>Addressing Feedback</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ignores feedback</li> <li>• Issues not tracked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some addressed</li> <li>• Incorrectly addressed</li> <li>• Inconsistency</li> <li>• Issues not tracked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly addressed</li> <li>• Mostly well addressed</li> <li>• Some inconsistency</li> <li>• Issues somewhat tracked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All addressed</li> <li>• Well addressed</li> <li>• Consistent</li> <li>• Issues tracked</li> </ul>
<b>Code Base of Prototype</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missing or useless</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor code quality</li> <li>• Inconsistent conventions</li> <li>• Less than ½ of requirements implemented</li> <li>• Cruft and dead code</li> <li>• Poor or no connectivity to server</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good quality</li> <li>• Some inconsistency</li> <li>• About ½ of requirements implemented</li> <li>• Has connectivity to server</li> <li>• Like Excellent, but lacking in some aspect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent effort</li> <li>• Mostly consistent</li> <li>• At least ½ of requirements implemented</li> <li>• Has connectivity to server</li> <li>• Clean code</li> <li>• Limit/error checking</li> </ul>
<b>Code Documentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missing or completely inconsistent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent</li> <li>• Difficult for a third party to understand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly consistent</li> <li>• Third party could understand</li> <li>• Mostly complete and clear Javadoc for entity (model) classes and methods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent</li> <li>• Easy to interpret</li> <li>• Complete and clear Javadoc for entity (model) classes and methods</li> </ul>
<b>Test Cases</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No tests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missing tests or tests cannot run</li> <li>• Unconvincing tests</li> <li>• Inconsistent</li> <li>• Tests do not check against expectations</li> <li>• Often testing existing Java collections or features</li> <li>• Not using JUnit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tests exist and can run</li> <li>• Mostly convincing tests</li> <li>• Mostly complete unit tests of entity (model) classes</li> <li>• Mostly complete intent tests for implemented use cases</li> <li>• Mostly consistent</li> <li>• Realistic test data</li> <li>• Like Excellent, but lacking in some aspect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test exist and can run</li> <li>• Convincing and passing tests for completed implementation</li> <li>• Comprehensive unit tests of entity (model) classes</li> <li>• Comprehensive intent tests for implemented use cases</li> <li>• Consistent</li> <li>• Realistic test data</li> <li>• Matches requirements (use cases and storyboards) and design</li> </ul>
<b>OOD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to demonstrate OOAD</li> <li>• Poor diagrams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhat OO, but poor design decisions</li> <li>• Unclear separation of concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly OO</li> <li>• Mostly separates concerns</li> <li>• Some information hiding</li> <li>• Mostly proper</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly OO</li> <li>• Properly separates concerns</li> <li>• Good information hiding</li> <li>• Proper encapsulation</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little information hiding</li> <li>• Breaks encapsulation</li> <li>• Missing classes and interfaces</li> <li>• Missing important elements</li> <li>• Includes unimportant elements</li> <li>• Inconsistent diagrams</li> <li>• Incorrect notation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encapsulation</li> <li>• Mostly clear classes and interfaces</li> <li>• Most important elements described</li> <li>• Mostly consistent diagrams</li> <li>• Mostly correct notation</li> <li>• Like Excellent, but lacking in some aspect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear classes and interfaces</li> <li>• Important elements described</li> <li>• Consistent diagrams</li> <li>• Correct notation</li> <li>• Boundary, control, and entity layering in architecture</li> <li>• Uses design patterns</li> <li>• Understandable design rationale and helpful commentary</li> <li>• Neatly laid out and labeled diagrams</li> </ul>
<b>Release Planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of planning or cursory effort</li> <li>• Poor grasp of agile principles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of planning or unrealistic planning</li> <li>• Late testing or integration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear planning, but with inconsistency or incompleteness</li> <li>• Like Excellent, but lacking in some aspect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear planning</li> <li>• Refers to requirements</li> <li>• Displays regular pacing of working software</li> <li>• Internal timelines</li> <li>• Tackles riskier tasks earlier</li> </ul>
<b>Reuse Statement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incomplete</li> <li>• Inconsistent</li> <li>• Unapproved reuse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some incompleteness</li> <li>• Some inconsistency</li> <li>• Approved reuse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete</li> <li>• Consistent</li> <li>• Approved reuse</li> </ul>
<b>Tangible Demo</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missing demo</li> <li>• Cannot demo</li> <li>• Less than a few members present</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some demo ability</li> <li>• Very rough</li> <li>• Inconsistent</li> <li>• Little or no user interface</li> <li>• A few members present</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demo ability</li> <li>• Rough edges</li> <li>• Realistic data and inputs</li> <li>• All but one member present</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demo ability</li> <li>• Clear and coherent</li> <li>• Realistic data and inputs</li> <li>• All members present</li> </ul>
<b>Tool Practices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited use (e.g., Dropbox, emailing zips)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent/infrequent use</li> <li>• Behalf-of-member commits</li> <li>• External deliverables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent, but frequent use among team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All team members commit to Git/Wiki regularly</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting Attendance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than half of group members attend for 1 or more meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All but two members attends all meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All but one member attends all meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All members attend all meetings.</li> </ul>

Addressing Feedback: U=0, S=1, G=2, E=3

Code Base: U=0, S=1, G=2, E=3

Code Documentation: U=0, S=0.5, G=1, E=2

Test Cases: U=0, S=1, G=2, E=3

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

Release Planning: U=0, S=0.5, G/E=1

Reuse Statement: U=0, S=0.5, G/E=1

Tangible Demo: U=0, S=0.5, G=1, E=2

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

Attendance: U=0, S=0.5, G=1, E=1.5

Relative Quality: U=0, S=0.5, G=1, E=1.5

score out of 22.5 scaled to mark out of 10

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.