|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 - All of the following | 0 - Any of the following |
| Requirements | * Major project requirements are explained * I understand what this software is expected to do. * Prototypes shown support my understanding of how this software is expected to work. | * Project requirements were not explained * Requirements were simply copied to the slides, and presenters read from the slides * Prototypes were not shown |
| Design | * A clearly readable UML diagram was presented. * The diagram shows class dependencies using consistent UML notation. | * No UML diagram * The diagram is hard to read (too much detail) * The diagram uses inconsistent notation |
|  | * It is clear how the design supports project requirements. | * Connection between design and project requirements is missing. * It is not entirely clear how this design supports the requirements. |
|  | * It is clear how the design supports possible future modifications to the requirements. | * No possible future modifications are mentioned. * Possible modifications are mentioned but it is unclear how the design supports them. |
|  | * The team demonstrated an understanding of software design by making a connection between their project and a design topic covered in class. | * The team did not demonstrate how their design used any topics covered in class. |
| Project Demo | * The team had a nice demonstration of their software. The demonstration went smoothly. | * The team did not demonstrate their software * The team demonstrated how their software works, there were issues during the demonstration. |
| Presentation Organization | * The presentation was well organized: had a clear beginning, middle, and end. | * The presentation was poorly organized * It was hard to follow this presentation |