# *Development Project II (420-K50-HR)*

# *Assignment 3 – Rubric V2: Testing, System Docs*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading Scheme and Rubric** | | | | | |
| **Your mark** | **Criteria** | **Sub-criteria**  (A mark out of 5 for each sub criteria) | **Excellent**  5 | **Average**  **(3-4)** | **Unacceptable**  **(1-3)** |
| /5 | 1**. Verbal**  **Contribution**  (Individual) | - Reactions  - Comments  - Questions  - Examples  - Unblocking | * Exhibited all sub-criteria in a respectful manner (constructive criticism, taking turns, etc.), in small and large group discussions, and when unsolicited. * Contributed written SCRUM and other notes when absent in class * Worked to ensure that each of the sub-criteria were front of mind during discussions (Reactions, Comments, etc) | * Exhibited most of sub-criteria in a respectful manner, but more so in small than in large groups or visa versa. * Did not contribute written SCRUM and other notes when absent in class | * Verbalized rarely and only when solicited. * Did not meaningful contribute to the team’s technical and non-technical work, verbally * No SCRUM and other notes were sent during absences |
| /5 | 3. **Focus and Attentiveness**  (individual) | - Small group discussions  - Large group discussions  - SCRUM meetings | * Always aware of the topic or issue being discussed, consistently engaged in active listening strategies (e.g., making connections between the course content and the project phase), and never engaged in activity that distracted you or others. * Spent no time being distracted (outside of normal 10 minute breaks), and stayed on task to deliver strongly on Project and assignment deliverable work | * Almost always aware of topic or issue being discussed and often engaged in active listening strategies. May have been distracted once or twice (bad day). * Spent a noticeable amount of time doing tasks outside of core Project deliverable and assignment work | * Frequently distracted or distracting (e.g., on computer, talking to others, or doing work for other class). * Spent major time doing tasks outside of core Project deliverable and assignment work |
| /10 | 5. **Technical Participation and Preparation: Section 1**  (Individual) | Came prepared with documents assembled and having been read  Lead and participated in the discussion at all key points  Did not become distracted during the team sessions  Worked diligently on the assignment subsections and deliverables  Created high quality documentation components, and worked with team members to integrate these in a cohesive fashion  Related task documentation on CSAZURE was up to date and detailed sufficiently | * Arrived with a clear understanding of project objective and tasking * Was prepared to talk about at least one previous project in Computer Science * Spent time understanding and analysing the benefits, negatives and other attributes of the previous project experiences and individual and group contributions * Clearly understood a ultimately positive or negative project outcomes, and delivered on these outcomes * High quality documentation outputs * Tasking on CSAZURE’s kanban board was of a high degree quality | * Was partially prepared * Participated but wasn’t readily able to provide depth when discussing the experiences of previous projects * Some degree of “social loafing” was witnessed i.e. being distracted in class, distracting from technical activity * Lower quality documentation outputs * Tasking on CSAZURE’s kanban board was of a mediocre quality | * Social loafing was witnessed and frequent (time spent not working in class) * Peers complained about a lack of participation (relates to #7 below) * Professor observation showed frequent distraction and inattentiveness to work * Majorly lacking technical task completion * Lowest quality documentation outputs * Poor CSAZURE kanban tasking quality |
| /10 | 6. **Technical Participation and Preparation: Section 2**  (Individual) | Came prepared with documents assembled and having been read  Lead and participated in the discussion at all key points  Did not become distracted during the team session  Worked diligently on the assignment subsections and deliverables  Related tasking on CSAZURE was kept up to date and detailed | * Arrived with a clear understanding of project objective and tasking * Was prepared to talk about at least one previous project in Computer Science * Spent time understanding and analysing the benefits, negatives and other attributes of the previous project experiences and individual and group contributions * Clearly understood a ultimately positive or negative project outcomes, and delivered on these outcomes | * Was partially prepared * Participated but wasn’t readily able to provide depth when discussing the experiences of previous projects * Some degree of “social loafing” was witnessed i.e. being distracted in class, distracting from technical activity * Technical output of documentation was lacking in quality and/or volume * Technical documentation was somewhat inaccurate * Lower quality outputs | * Social loafing was witnessed and frequent (time spent not working in class) * Peers complained about a lack of participation (relates to #7 below) * Professor observation showed frequent distraction and inattentiveness to work * Majorly lacking technical task completion * Lowest quality outputs |
| /5 | 6. **Technical Participation and Preparation**  *(Sections 1 & 2)*  (Group) | Came prepared with documents assembled and having been read  Each member actively participated in the discussion at all key points  Did not become distracted during the team working sessions (in class, out of class, both)  Worked diligently on the assignment subsections and deliverables  Related tasking on CSAZURE was kept up to date and detailed | * Arrived with a clear understanding of tasks to be worked on and accomplished * Tasks were kept up to date, and technical accuracy was achieved on CSAZURE’s board * Worked diligently to deliver on project deliverables and sections * Spent time understanding and analyzing what was needed for the assignment, worked diligently to ensure that all team members understood well their work tasks and pieces. | * Was partially prepared for technical activity * Technically accuracy was somewhat achieved on CSAZURE’s board * Group members participated but weren’t readily able to add depth when discussing and working on the project deliverables * Some degree of “social loafing” was witnessed i.e. being distracted in class (as a team) | * The group appeared unprepared for technical activity * Tasks on CSAZURE were largely out of date, not detailed, or otherwise inaccurate * A high degree of “social loafing” was witnessed i.e. being distracted in class (as a team) |
| /5 | 7. **Peer evaluation**  (Individual) | Contribution to the individual and group work  Participated actively, and or led discussions at times during the group work  Did not engaged in any distracting work | * A high mark (> 80%) was attained by the points distribution of peers | * A moderate mark * (> 70%) was attained by the points distribution of peers | * A low or failing mark (< 70%) was attained by the points distribution of peers |
| */10*  *(Optional deduction)* | **Safe Classroom**  (Individual) | Respected the tenets of fairness and equity and participation contained within the Safe Classroom presentation.  *(up to a 50% mark deduction, individually, for creating an unsafe classroom, attached to this rubric, Slides 6, 7, 8)* | | | |
|  | Totals | **Mark**  **/40** |  |  |  |
|  | **Evaluator comments**: | | | | |