

# **Software Development Capstone Rubrics**

## **Mark Breakdown**

Proposal - 10%

Professional Software Development - 40%

- Code Quality - 30%
  - Checkpoint 1 = 5%
  - Checkpoint 2 = 5%
  - Checkpoint 3 = 20%
- Peer Evaluation - 10%

Functionality - 40%

- Checkpoint 1 = 5%
- Checkpoint 2 = 5%
- Checkpoint 3 = 30%

Presentation - 10%

# PROJECT MANAGEMENT (10%)

## PROPOSAL

### DESCRIPTION

This assignment will have you craft a proposal and plan to make a case for your chosen challenge. You will need to describe the challenge, identify the issue you will be addressing, outline your solution and create a plan for the build.

You can't just jump into a large project like this. First you must work through some form of proposal to ensure you understand everything that is required and to be able to present your solution to a client. The conclusion of the project may differ from your initial proposal but having a clear vision of what you're wanting to accomplish will allow a client to sign off on your proposal so you can move forward with your project.

This assignment forms part of your "Proposal" grade at the end of the course. When you have completed your assignment, follow your instructor's directions to submit it for grading.

### INSTRUCTIONS

#### *Preparation*

You've selected a challenge so now you need to work out a solution for it. This isn't easy but hopefully school helped you figure a few things out. If you still are unsure about what you're hoping to do please contact your instructor so you can discuss this.

#### *Write a Proposal*

Sounds easy, right? Think of this as the single document that will convince a client that you are the one to hire for this project. It's a make-or-break kind of document so don't take it lightly.

**Your proposal must include AT LEAST the following content:**

- Description of the project
- Description of the issue you are addressing
- **Detailed** description of your proposed solution
- A project management plan
- Git repository set up for the program
- Jira project management set up
- Planned sprints (give yourself 11 weeks)
- Please include any other details that may be necessary to convince a client that your idea is the best possible solution

### HOW TO SUBMIT

**Submit the assignment following instructions from your course supervisor**

## PROPOSAL RUBRIC

	4 - Exceptional	3 - Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<b>Quantity</b>	All content areas are addressed sufficiently	1 content areas are not addressed	2–3 content areas are not addressed	More than 3 content areas are not addressed
<b>Quality</b>	Content includes all necessary information <b>AND</b> content makes sense within the context of the proposal.	Content includes most of the necessary information <b>OR</b> content mostly makes sense within the context of the proposal.	Content includes some of the necessary information <b>OR</b> content makes a little sense within the context of the proposal.	Content includes little of the necessary information <b>OR</b> content doesn't make sense within the context of the proposal.
<b>Git Setup</b>	Git is set up and ready for the project			Git is set up but not ready to work within
<b>Jira Setup</b>	Jira is set up and the project plan is complete			Jira is set up with minimal content present
<b>Grammar &amp; Structure</b>	Content contains no grammatical errors, strong structure <b>AND</b> fits assignment perfectly.	Content submitted with minimal or no grammatical errors and structure is strong. Related to assignment with few connection errors.	Content submitted but grammar and/or structure is weak <b>OR</b> does not fit assignment well.	Content not submitted <b>OR</b> does not fit assignment.
<b>Professionalism</b>	Submitted content is written and designed in a professional manner and could be used within a proper business setting.	Submitted document's professionalism is good but could be improved.	Submitted document's professionalism could use a number of improvements.	Submitted document is unprofessional and needs major revisions.

# PROFESSIONAL SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT GRADE 40%

## CODE QUALITY 30%

### 3 checkpoints

Checkpoint 1 - 5 %

Checkpoint 2 - 5 %

Checkpoint 3 - 30 %

### RUBRIC

	4 - Exceptional	3 - Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<b>Code Optimization</b>	Code quality is strong and efficient.	Code is good but has room for further optimization	Code is basic with minor optimization	Code works but has no optimization
<b>Code Description/Comments within codes</b>	Code is prepared with descriptions and comments to allow an easy understanding	Comments and descriptions are present but elements are missing or weak	Few comments or descriptions present	Comments and descriptions are present but not functional
<b>Code Consistency/Readability (File Organization, Appearance, etc.)</b>	Code is consistently developed according to plan	Code has some elements that do not follow a similar path	Code is inconsistent and elements are confusing	Code is not consistent with elements looking very different
<b>Code design</b>	Submitted content is written and designed in a professional manner and could be used within a proper business setting.	Submitted document's professionalism is good but could be improved.	Submitted document's professionalism could use a number of improvements.	Submitted document is unprofessional and needs major revisions.
<b>Development Tools</b>	Git commits are of reasonable size with clear messages. Git branching strategy is sensible and consistent. Progress is clearly being tracked using Jira	Git commits are infrequent or have unclear messages. Branches do not separate functionality. Jira tracking is inconsistent.	Git commits are rarely used and messages are unclear. Branches are not functional. Jira tracking not used correctly.	Git commits almost non existent and comments are not present. Branches not used. Jira set up but not used.

# PEER EVALUATION 10%

## RUBRIC

Each group member will fill this out and evaluate your group members. The given mark will be based on the feedback from your group members. You will be expected to add comments in the box to support the mark given.

	4 - Exceptional	3 - Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
Group Member Name:				
Group Member Name:				
Group Member Name:				
Group Member Name:				
Self-Evaluation				

CHECKPOINTS/DELIVERABLES/ FUNCTIONALITY 40%

RUBRIC

Checkpoint 1 - 5%

Sprint Review	Met most of goals within this sprint	Met some goals within the sprint	Met few goals within the sprint	Attempted goals within the sprint
---------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Checkpoint #2 - 5%

Sprint Review	Met most of goals within this sprint	Met some goals within the sprint	Met few goals within the sprint	Attempted goals within the sprint
---------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Checkpoint #3 (final) - 30%

Sprint Review	Met most of goals within this sprint	Met some goals within the sprint	Met few goals within the sprint	Attempted goals within the sprint
---------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------------

# PRESENTATION (10%)

## Presentation

	4 - Exceptional	3 - Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<b>Organization</b>	Group presentation is logical, easy to follow format and maintained audience interest.	Group presented material in logical form; easy to follow.	Audience had some difficulty in following the presentation.	Audience could not follow presentation. No or poor sequencing of information was present.
<b>Subject Knowledge</b>	Group "owned" the information and answered questions in depth with explanations and elaborations.	Group was at ease with information and answered questions but did not elaborate.	Group was uncomfortable with information and could not answer questions convincingly.	Group did not have grasp of the information and could not answer questions about the subject.
<b>Visual Component/ Live demo</b>	Visual components reinforced the presentation and helped captivate the audience's attention during the presentation.	Visual component related to the presentation but was only partially effective in conveying the information.	Visual component was present but did not help convey information or do justice to the content.	Visual components, if used, were ineffective and unrelated to topic.
<b>Mechanics</b>	Presentation was free of spelling, capitalization, and grammatical errors.	Presentation included no more than 3 spelling, capitalization, or grammatical errors.	Presentation included no more than 4 spelling, capitalization, or grammatical errors.	Presentation included no more than 5 spelling, capitalization, or grammatical errors.
<b>Audience Q&amp;A</b>	All questions were answered concisely with a clear understanding.	Questions were answered with some difficulty or not completely	Questions were not clearly answered and understanding was not demonstrated	Questions were acknowledged
<b>Elocution</b>	Group spoke clearly, expressively, and correctly, and the audience enjoyed listening to the presentation.	Groups overall voices were clear and the audience could hear and understand most of the presentation	Group could be partially understood; audience had some difficulty in hearing or understanding the presentation	Group could not be understood because of poor language and communication skills and/or the group spoke too low or quietly.