Web Name Game Evaluation rubric

	1	2	3	4	Points Assigned
Software Engineer Code Review	Poor architecture focused on minimally meeting the functional requirements; consistently violates DRY / SOLID principles; no version control; documentation consists of little more than (poorly commented) system code.	Acceptable implementation; some violations of DRY / SOLID principles; implementation seems brittle and not built to evolve; some version control; moderate documentation quality.	Satisfactory, flexible implementation; demonstrates understanding of DRY / SOLID principles; good use of version control; good documentation quality.	Excellent architecture and superb implementation; flexible architecture can accommodate potential future changes; demonstrates mastery of DRY / SOLID principles; uses version control best practices; excellent documentation including implementation choices, relevant code details, information to enable future developers to evolve system.	
Web Fundamentals Review	HTML tags are miss-used; website is not keyboard accessible; styles are inconsistent or repetitive.	Basic semantic tags are used, with mostly correct usage; game can be played with the keyboard; basic style structure.	Proper semantic tags are used all the time; entire website is accessible; uses a style methodology to promote re-use.	Extra attention given to accessibility and SEO; styles are modular and show fluency in the browser.	
QA Pass	Crashes; implementation seems buggy; missing key functional requirements; includes no unit tests.	No crashes found; implementation is mostly bug-free and meets most functional requirements; includes one or more unit tests.	Bug-free implementation meeting all functional requirements; includes multiple well-executed unit tests.	Performant, bug-free implementation that meets or exceeds all functional requirements; includes a comprehensive set of unit tests and/or UI tests.	
Design Review	Feels laggy in spots; animations and/or UI is inconsistent throughout; does not implement key suggested UI details; design breaks on small screens.	Feels laggy in spots; animations and/or UI is consistent throughout; implements some suggested UI details; works passable well on small devices.	User experience is even throughout, without lag or rough edges; implements most suggested UI details; design accommodates desktop and mobile.	Attention to detail around UI response time, animations, screen transitions, etc. such that app is a pleasure to use; implements all suggested UI details; responsive/fluid design for a range of screen sizes.	