

Rubric – Software Development Workshop II

1. Hands-on Practices (15%)

Criteria for assessment	Performance levels				
	Excellent 10 / A / 4	Good 8 / B / 3	Satisfactory 6 / C / 2	Marginal Pass 4 / D / 1	Fail F / 0
Function implementation (70 % weighting)	The program passes all the test cases and is implemented according to the requirements.	The program passes most test cases and is implemented according to the requirements or the program passes all the test cases but does not follow some of the requirements.	The program passes half around test cases and is implemented according to the requirements or the program passes all the test cases but does not follow requirements.	The program fails most cases but is implemented according to most requirements or the program passes most test cases but does not follow requirements.	The program fails and does not follow any requirements.
Program structure (10 % weighting)	The program structure follows design completely	The program structure follows most part of the design	The program structure follows only a few parts in the design	The program structure follows very few parts in the design	The program structure does not follow the design at all
Comment (10 % weighting)	Comments are appropriated added and explain the program very well.	Comments help the explanation but are improper at some places.	Comments are provided with some help	Comments are sparse or vague.	No comments are provided.
Coding style (10 % weighting)	A clear coding style is consistently applied, greatly enhancing program readability	A clear coding style is consistently used in the most part of the program, helping in the program readability.	A coding style is used in a small part of program. The program is not readable at some places.	Only a very few efforts are made in improving the program readability.	No coding style is applied for the purpose of readability.

2. Quizzes (35%)

Criteria for assessment	Performance levels				
	Excellent 10 / A / 4	Good 8 / B / 3	Satisfactory 6 / C / 2	Marginal Pass 4 / D / 1	Fail F / 0

Algorithm correctness (50 % weighting)	The program algorithm is correct.	The program algorithm is correct but with minor flaws.	The program algorithm has a middle flaw.	The algorithm has a big flaw.	No algorithm can be captured.
Algorithm effectiveness (20% weighting)	The algorithm is very efficient.	The algorithm is efficient not the best solution.	The algorithm is fair.	The algorithm is very inefficient.	No algorithm can be captured.
Statements (30% weighting)	Statements are correctly used without errors.	Statements are correctly used with minor errors.	Statements are used with middle errors.	Statements are used with serious errors.	Statements are completely wrong.

3. Projects (50%)

Programming in Project (50%)

<i>Criteria for assessment</i>	<i>Performance levels</i>				
	Excellent 10 / A / 4	Good 8 / B / 3	Satisfactory 6 / C / 2	Marginal Pass 4 / D / 1	Fail F / 0
Function implementation (70 % weighting)	The program passes all the test cases and is implemented according to the requirements.	The program passes most test cases and is implemented according to the requirements or the program passes all the test cases but does not follow some of the requirements.	The program passes half around test cases and is implemented according to the requirements or the program passes all the test cases but does not follow requirements.	The program fails most cases but is implemented according to most requirements or the program passes most test cases but does not follow requirements.	The program fails and does not follow any requirements.
Program structure (10 % weighting)	The program structure follows design completely	The program structure follows most part of the design	The program structure follows only a few parts in the design	The program structure follows very few parts in the design	The program structure does not follow the design at all
Comment (10 % weighting)	Comments are appropriated added and explain the program very well.	Comments help the explanation but are improper at some places.	Comments are provided with some help	Comments are sparse or vague.	No comments are provided.
Coding style (10 % weighting)	A clear coding style is consistently applied, greatly enhancing program readability	A clear coding style is consistently used in the most part of the program, helping in the program readability.	A coding style is used in a small part of program. The program is not readable at some places.	Only a very few efforts are made in improving the program readability.	No coding style is applied for the purpose of readability.

Oral Presentation (20%)

Criteria for assessment	Performance levels				
	Excellent 10 / A / 4	Good 8 / B / 3	Satisfactory 6 / C / 2	Marginal Pass 4 / D / 1	Fail F / 0
Content of presentation					
Organization (20% weighting)	Organizes ideas into clearly identifiable sections with logical sequence which audience can follow.	Organizes into identifiable sections with most information presented in logical sequence which audience can follow.	Audience has difficulty following presentation because student jumps around sections.	The presentation had limited identifiable sections and there is no sequence of information. Audience can not follow and understand presentation.	Absence or late in the scheduled time for presentation without providing an acceptable reason
Accuracy (20% weighting)	Information is precise, explicit and consistently accurate.	No significant error is made; a few inconsistencies in information	Some errors are made to distract knowledgeable listener, and/or some information are accurate.	Information is mostly inaccurate.	
Depth (30% weighting)	Key concept and theory is accurately and well explained; application of theory is included to illuminate issue; depth of presentation is appropriated for the audience.	For the most part, explanation of concept and theory is accurate and complete; some helpful applications are included; depth of presentation is generally appropriated for the audience.	Explanation of concept and theory is accurate but incomplete; little attempt is made to tie theory to practice; a certain portion of presentation is too elementary or sophisticated for the audience.	Explanation of concept and theory is mostly inaccurate and incomplete; no application is included; presentation is mostly too elementary or too sophisticated for the audience.	
Presentation techniques					
Oral English (10% weighting)	Oral English was elegant and clear with correct pronunciation; sentences are complete and grammatical correct; vocabularies are chosen for precise meaning.	Oral English was clear, but with a little accent; for the most part, sentences are complete and grammatical in most parts; with a few exceptions, vocabularies are chosen for their precise meaning.	Oral English is smooth but with some accent; some sentences are incomplete/halting; some grammatical errors are evident; vocabularies are limited or inappropriate.	Oral English was awkward; numerous grammatical errors; vocabularies cannot focus on the idea presented.	Absence or late in the scheduled time for presentation without providing an acceptable reason

Program Overview (20 % weighting)	The student can clearly articulated how the application works and the reason for the structures(approaches) chosen	The student articulate how the code works, but only vaguely can explain the reason for structures (approaches)chosen	There is evidence that the students understand how the code works, but the details are not presented enough.	There is evidence that the students understand how the code works but the details are poorly presented	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Documentation (20%)

<i>Criteria for assessment</i>	<i>Performance levels</i>				
	Excellent 10 / A / 4	Good 8 / B / 3	Satisfactory 6 / C / 2	Marginal Pass 4 / D / 1	Fail F / 0
Completeness (30% weighting)	The document include almost all the required details	The document misses some details, including one or two important parts.	The document includes nearly half required details	The document loses most required details.	The document contains no required details.
Correctness (40% weighting)	The details described in the documents are correct	Some details in the documents are incorrect	Half of the document includes incorrect details	Most details are incorrect.	The document contains none or very few correct details
Readability (30% weighting)	The document is organized very well and understandable.	The document is organized but include a few information that is not very clear	Some parts of the document are not readable	Most parts in the document are not readable.	The document is not readable at all.

Teamwork (10%)

<i>Criteria for assessment</i>	<i>Performance levels</i>				
	Excellent 10 / A / 4	Good 8 / B / 3	Satisfactory 6 / C / 2	Marginal Pass 4 / D / 1	Fail F / 0
Contribution to development (50 % weighting)	Fully contribute to the project in every phase of software development	Contribute to most of the project development	Partially contribute to the project development	Contribute to very little of the project development	No any contribution to the project development
Contribution to project management (20% weighting)	Fully contribute to the project management	Contribute to most of the project management	Partially contribute to the project management	Contribute to very little of the project management	No any contribution to the project management

Project Management (20% weighting)	All the related project info is well managed	The project info. Is under control but some are missing.	Around half projectrelated info is missing	Only very less project info can be found	No project info is offered at all.
Cooperation (10% weighting)	A member enjoys communication with other members and has no complaints	A member cooperates with others but complains from time to time	A member cooperates with others but complains always	A member cannot cooperate with others but does not require to change group	A member cannot cooperate with others and requires changing group.