

## Rubric – Software Development Workshop III

### Model generation

<i>Criteria for assessment</i>	<i>Performance levels</i>				
	<b>Excellent 10 / A / 4</b>	<b>Good 8 / B / 3</b>	<b>Satisfactory 6 / C / 2</b>	<b>Marginal Pass 4 / D / 1</b>	<b>Fail F / 0</b>
<b>Completeness</b> (50% weighting)	The key elements and their relationships described in the questions are well captured.	The key elements and their relationships described in the questions are captured with less than 1/3 key elements and relationships missing or incorrect.	The key elements and their relationships described in the questions are captured with less than 2/3 key elements and relationships missing or incorrect.	Some key elements and their relationships (less than 1/3) described in the questions are captured correctly.	No key elements or relationships are captured correctly.
<b>Consistency</b> (20% weighting)	All the parts in the software requirements specification are consistent.	Most parts in the software requirements specification are consistent. One or two inconsistencies can be found.	Three inconsistencies are found in the software requirements specification.	Four inconsistencies are found in the software requirements specification.	More than four inconsistencies are found in the software requirements specification.
<b>Redundancy</b> (20% weighting)	All the elements and relationships in the diagrams are from the problem statements in the questions.	One or two elements and relationships are not from problem statements in the questions.	Three elements and relationships are not from problem statements in the questions.	Four elements and relationships are not from problem statements in the questions.	More than four elements and relationships are not from problem statements in the questions.
<b>Graphic notation</b> (10% weighting)	Notation is correctly used.	Notation is correctly used with minor flaws.	Notation is used with some moderate errors.	Notation is used with major errors.	Notation is not used or used incorrectly.

## Documentation

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
<b>Completeness</b> ( 30% weighting)	The document includes 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.
<b>Correctness</b> ( 40% weighting)	The details described in the document are correct.	Some details in the document are incorrect.	Half of the document includes incorrect details.	Most details are incorrect.	The document contains no or very few correct details.
<b>Readability</b> ( 30% weighting)	The document is organized very well and understandable.	The document is organized but includes 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.

## Programming

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
<b>Function implementation</b> ( 50 % 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.
<b>Program structure</b> (40 % 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.
<b>Comment</b> (5 % weighting)	Comments are appropriately added and explain the program very well.	Comments help the explanation but are improper at some places.	Comments are provided with some help in program understanding.	Comments are sparse or vague.	No comments are provided.
<b>Code style</b> (5 % 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.

### Teamwork

<i>Criteria for assessment</i>	<i>Performance levels</i>				
	<b>Excellent 10 / A / 4</b>	<b>Good 8 / B / 3</b>	<b>Satisfactory 6 / C / 2</b>	<b>Marginal Pass 4 / D / 1</b>	<b>Fail F / 0</b>
<b>Contribution to development</b> (50 % weighting)	Fully contribute to the project in each 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.
<b>Contribution to project management</b> (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.
<b>Project Management</b> (20% weighting)	All the related project info. Is well managed.	The project information Is under control but some are missing..	Around half project-related information is missing.	Only very less project information can be found.	No project information is offered at all.
<b>Cooperation</b> (10% weighting)	Fully enjoys communication with other members and has no complaints.	Cooperates with others but complains from time to time.	Cooperates with others but complains always.	Unable to cooperate with others but does not require to move to another team.	Require to move to another team because of the teamwork difficulty.

### Tools application

<i>Criteria for assessment</i>	<i>Performance levels</i>				
	<b>Excellent 10 / A / 4</b>	<b>Good 8 / B / 3</b>	<b>Satisfactory 6 / C / 2</b>	<b>Marginal Pass 4 / D / 1</b>	<b>Fail F / 0</b>
<b>Skillfulness</b> ( 100% weighting)	The student can use the tool skillfully .	The student can use the tool skillfully in most time.	The student can use the tool bot unskillfully.	The student catches only a little bit of the tool's features.	The student does not know the features of the tool at all,

## Oral Presentation

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
<b>Feature introduction</b> (15% weighting)	Slides clearly reflect main features of the developed software.	Slides reflect most features of the developed software.	Slides reflect only part features of the developed software.	Slides reflect very few features of the developed software.	The slides do not tell anything about the developed software.
<b>Slide design</b> (15% weighting)	Slides are designed very attractively and help the promotion of software.	The slides are designed with only a few attractive elements to help the promotion of software.	The slides are designed in a common and boring way.	The slides are designed in a common and boring way and contain some negative elements.	The slides are designed without any help in the software promotion.
<b>Presentation</b> (20% weighting)	The product is well advertised through the slide show in a very attractive way.	The product is well advertised through the slide show but not very attractive.	The product is introduced in a fair way.	The product is introduced unclearly or very boringly.	The product introduction is not finished.
<b>Demo</b> (30% weighting)	The main functions in the developed software are clearly demonstrated and introduced in a smooth way.	The main functions in the developed software are clearly demonstrated and introduced, but the demo flow is a bit awkward.	Most functions in the developed software are demonstrated and introduced but the demo flow is not smooth or the introduction is not clear.	Only part of the functions are demonstrated and introduced.	No functions are demonstrated or introduced.
<b>Responsiveness</b> (10% weighting)	Highly responsive to audience comments and questions on the product.	Generally responsive to audience comments and questions on the product.	Reluctantly interacts with audience; responds to question or comments on the product inadequately.	Unable to answer most questions or give the feedbacks from audience.	Unable to answer any questions.
<b>Time management</b> ( 10% weighting)	The feature and demo introduction is finished in time.	The feature and demo is a little bit overrun; within 1 minute above the allotted time.	The feature and demo is overrun for more than 1 minute.	The feature and demo is overrun for more than 1 minute and not all contents are able to be presented.	Absence or late in the scheduled time for presentation without providing an acceptable reason