

Title : \_\_\_\_\_

Defense Date & Time : \_\_\_\_\_

**Rubric for Project Charter**

Criteria	Exemplary (5 pts)	Developing (3 pts)	Needs improvement (1 pt.)	SCORE
<b>Teamwork</b>	The team worked well together to achieve objectives. Each member contributed in a valuable way to the project. All data sources indicated a high level of mutual respect and collaboration.	The team worked well together most of the time, with only a few occurrences of communication breakdown or failure to collaborate when appropriate. Members were mostly respectful of each other.	Team did not collaborate or communicate well. Some members would work independently, without regard to objectives or priorities. A lack of respect and regard was frequently noted.	
<b>Contribution</b>	All requirements and objectives are identified, evaluated and competed. The deliverable offered new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Likewise, the application is based on stated criteria, analysis and constraints.	All requirements are identified and evaluated but some objectives are not completed. The deliverable offered some new information or approach to the topic under discussion. The application is reasonable; further analysis of some of the alternatives or constraints may have led to a different recommendation.	Many requirements and objectives are not identified, evaluated and/or completed. The deliverable offered no new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Few application considerations are analyzed and other factors were ignored or incompletely analyzed.	
<b>Subject Knowledge</b>	The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major and minor concepts into the response. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking about the topic.	The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major concepts into the response. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of limited research effort and/or initial of thinking about the topic.	The deliverable did not demonstrate knowledge of the course content, evidence of the research effort or depth of thinking about the topic.	
<b>Supporting Material</b>	All relevant information was obtained and information sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were well supported by the information.	Sufficient information was obtained and most sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were mostly supported by the information.	Insufficient information was obtained and/or sources lack validity. Analysis and design considerations were not supported by the information collected.	
<b>Composition</b>	The deliverable was well organized and clearly written. The underlying logic was clearly articulated and easy to follow. Words were chosen that precisely expressed the intended meaning and supported reader comprehension. Diagrams or analyses enhanced and clarified presentation of ideas. Sentences were grammatical and free from errors.	The deliverable was organized and clearly written for the most part. In some areas the logic and/or flow of ideas were difficult to follow. Words were well chosen with some minor expectations. Diagrams were consistent with the text. Sentences were mostly grammatical and/or only a few spelling errors were present but they did not hinder the reader.	The deliverable lacked overall organization. The reader had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. Diagrams were absent or inconsistent with the text. Grammatical and spelling errors made it difficult for the reader to interpret the text in places.	
<b>TOTAL</b>				

# **Rubric for Prototype Presentation**

Criteria	Exemplary (5 pts)	Developing (3 pts)	Needs improvement (1 pt.)	SCORE
<b>Appropriate technology (drawings, prototype, other medium)to perform task</b>	Clearly identifies a range of possible alternative technologies to create an understanding of the product and chooses the most appropriate to perform the task.	Applies selected technology to perform the task with some efficiency and effectiveness. Displays understanding of the results.	Uses selected technology inaccurately to perform task ineffectively and inefficiently, while demonstrating only a minimal understanding of purpose and results.	
<b>Development of work</b>	Students did thumbnail images, and user interfaces to get an idea of which way to continue.	Students did some planning ahead of time to develop ideas.	Students just began working without thinking out different possibilities.	
<b>Construction of UI.</b>	Evidence of thorough work appropriate to the time allotted, UI or prototype were complete with attention to detail.	Evidence of work done on the project. Project is seen as complete.	Students left some stuff undone due to lack of work or time.	
<b>Aesthetics</b>	UI are crisp and clean with measurements labeled properly. Prototype does not show evidence of sloppiness.	Prototype is clean and neat, but not particularly attractive to the eye.	Prototype are unsightly and messy	
<b>Presentation</b>	Articulate and well planned explanation of drawings or prototype. All parts are described.	Fair explanation, some description of parts.	Some explanation, leaving much misunderstood.	
<b>TOTAL</b>				

INDIVIDUAL GRADES

Member Names (full names in alphabetical order)	System			Delivery	Other		TOTAL
	System Knowledge (25 pts)	Topic Knowledge (20 pts)	Ability to answer Questions (20 pts)	Voice Quality & Delivery (15 pts)	Proper Attire (10 pts)	Arrival Time (10 pts)	

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature over printed name