# COMP 4710: Software Engineering Senior Design Arch. Spike Grade Sheet

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Team** |  | **Cycle** | Architectural Spike |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TEAM EVALUATION** | | | |
| **Category** | **Description / Rubric** | **Max Points** | **Points Earned** |
| **Presentation** | **All aspects of the project were addressed.** *4 points: Extremely organized and clear; all areas of project and process addressed in detail; excellent supporting artifacts, charts, diagrams, etc. Very professional appearance and conduct.*  *3 points: Well-paced and organized; all major areas addressed with clarity; a few details missing; some supporting material; professional appearance and conduct; inspires great confidence.*  *2 points: Moderately organized presentation; most topics addressed; important details omitted; inspires reasonable confidence; moderately professional. 1 point: Poor organization, communication; Unprofessional manner or appearance; many technical or grammatical errors. Significant areas of project and process not addressed. 0 points: Completely lacking in detail and confidence; One or more members absent or not participating.* | 4 | 4.0 |
| **Product Demo** | **Demo of working prototype consistent with cycle intent and customer vision.**  *4 points: Meets ALL requirements or goals for spike phase; Professional, polished product; suitable as v1.0 production software. Completely inspires confidence in project success.*  *3 points: Meets most requirements/goals for spike; requires only minor changes; interface, appearance, & operation effective and friendly. Highly confident in continued success.*  *2 points: Several requirements/goals not addressed; some technical hurdles not overcome; some risks not addressed; key components not tested or missing. Moderate confidence in project success.*  *1 point: Demo meets only a portion of requirements; unpolished interface; limited features; not a professional product or effort. Raises significant concerns about chances of project success.*  *0 points: Demo missing, non-functional, or does not satisfy most cycle requirements. Success doubtful.* | 4 | 3.0 |
| **Written Report** | **Quality, organization, substance, thoroughness. Should include all required documentation for cycle** (e.g. description/metaphor, requirements/user stories/use cases, data/network/protocol specs or schemas, design documents/UML, process documentation, management plan/schedule/assignments, test plans, correspondence/minutes, etc.)  *3 points: All artifacts included, organized, and professional in nature; shows mastery of software process, documentation, and project management.*  *2 points: Most artifacts included, relatively organized and professional; shows understanding of how to employ process; some artifacts could use improvement.*  *1 point: Many artifacts mission or pro-forma. Shows limited adherence to software process or project management. Not indicative of a professional approach. 0 points: Most artifacts missing, incomplete, or only pro-forma; limited attention to detail; very unprofessional; lack of understanding or complete disregard of process, management, or discipline.* | 3 | 3.0 |
| **Team Comments** |  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION** | | | | |
| **Member Name** | John Doe | Bob Jones | Jane Doe | Mary Smith |
| **Presentation & Class Participation** Individual participation, contribution, and effectiveness in cycle presentation. Attendance at all classes and team meetings. *2: Satisfactory*  *1: Needs Improvement*  *0: Unsatisfactory* | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| **Peer Review / Participation** Peer evaluation submitted on time; contains useful feedback & constructive criticism; not just pro forma.  *2: Satisfactory*  *1: Needs Improvement*  *0: Unsatisfactory* | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 |
| **Individual Grade** *15 points max* | 14.0 | 12.5 | 13.0 | 12.0 |