VANIER | Continuing Education
CÉGEP/COLLEGE

CÉGEP VANIER COLLEGE

CONTINUING EDUCATION

SOFTWARE APPLICATIONS SPECIALIST

CAPSTONE PROJECT

NAME OF STUDENT: _____

Please complete the questionnaire below and use the rubric on the second page to evaluate the student's performance in each of the areas below. The final mark should be on a total of 100 points.

Completed by _____ Date _____

*This form is NOT to be filled out by the student, but by the Internship Coordinator.

VANIER | Continuing Education
CÉGEP/COLLEGE

Criteria	Unsatisfactory (0-1)*n[1]	Below average 2*n[1]	Average 3*n[1]	Above average 4*n[1]	Superior 5*n[1]	
Proposal						**/10**
New idea	The idea has already been implemented	The project idea is new	-	-	-	**/2**
Presentation	Contents of the presentation are weak. The idea and the design are not clear. Presentation skills are not satisfactory. Lack of knowledge in the topic. Slides design was not good. Topic cannot be accepted.	Most the content of the presentation is weak. Design is somehow not clear. Presentation skills are weak. Not enough knowledge in the topic. Slides design was not clear.	Some of the contents are not well presented. Some parts are not clear. Presentation skills are average. More knowledge and research in the topic are needed. Average slides design.	Most content are well presented. Few parts are not clear. Design clearance needs slight improvement. Presentation skills are good. Slides are well designed.	All content of the project are presented efficiently. All parts are clear. Outstanding design. Great amount of knowledge in the topic presented. Outstanding presentation skills.	**/5**
Potential implement	There is no potential for the project to be implemented and commercialized	With some improvements, project can be commercialized	Project can be released in a store, or used by the industry	-	-	**/3**
Analysis						**/20**
Detailed Analysis	Project components were not analyzed.	Most components were not analyzed.	Some components were analyzed effectively, but not all required.	Most of the components of the project were analyzed clearly.	The project was analyzed efficiently. The analysis covers all	**/5**

					components that need to be analyzed.	
Diagrams	Diagram were not designed properly. No systemic approach was used to analyze the project. Requirements are not demonstrated.	Some diagrams were drawn, but not well designed. Not enough diagrams. Requirement are not well demonstrated.	Diagrams were designed using professional CASE tools. The diagrams design is average. Analysis approach(s) were used, but not completely correct. Requirements are demonstrated but are not clear.	Diagrams are well designed. CASE tools were used well. Analysis coverage is good. Right approach(s) were used. Requirements are demonstrated.	Well-designed diagrams. Clear and professional design by CASE tool. Right and more than an approach was used effectively, and requirements are demonstrated.	**/15**
Design & Implementation						**/40**
Database	Each table design is weak. Primary and secondary keys are not provided. Fields types are not correct. No normalization. No access controls. There is a lot of redundant data and no accuracy.	Table design is weak. Primary and secondary keys are not appropriately chosen. Field types and validation is not good. Weak normalization. Redundant data.	Table design is acceptable. Primary and Secondary keys are provided for most tables. Fields types are mostly right. Acceptable normalization. Few redundant data.	Good table design. Good choice of primary and secondary keys. Fields types are well chosen. Acceptable normalization and very little redundant data.	Each table is well designed. Primary and secondary are used. Fields types are right. Tables normalized. Tables are connected properly. No redundant data. Access control. Support accuracy and integrity.	**/10**
Code correctness	Project does not function well. All scenarios/stories fail. Program crashes.	Project functions partially. Not all suggested scenarios/stories work. Few crashes.	Project works. Some crashes. Many scenarios/stories work. Some	Program function well. Most of scenarios/stories work. No crash. Most	Program functions as planned. All scenarios/stories work. No crash. All	**/12**

	Exceptions are not caught.	Few exceptions are caught.	exceptions are caught.	exceptions are caught.	possible exceptions are caught.	
Time & space complexity	Time complexity Big O is very slow. memory(space) utilization is not efficient. A lot of memory leaks.	Time complexity Big O is slow. memory(space) is not used utilized efficiently. Some memory leaks.	Time complexity and memory(space) complexity are within acceptable range. Few memory leaks.	Time complexity and memory(space) complexity are fast and efficient. No memory leaks.	No further optimization is required for the program in terms of time and memory(space) utilization. No memory leaks.	**/5**
Recommended Coding	No modularity. No comments. No room for expansion. Complicated, Unproper naming conversation. No data validation. Not Object-oriented design.	The design modularity is weak. Not enough comments. Small room for expansion. Complicated. Not right naming conversation. Not enough data validation. Object-oriented design concepts are not there.	Some modularity. Few comments. Some functionalities can be expanded. Modern complexity. Acceptable naming conversation. Some data validation. Acceptable Object-oriented design.	Code is modalized, and robust. Most parts of the code are well commented. Room for expanding and extension. Good Object-oriented design. Great naming conversion. Simple and easy to understand.	Code is modalized, and robust. All parts of the code are well commented. Great room for expanding and extension. Great Object-oriented design. Great naming conversion. Simple and easy to understand.	**/8**
HMI	Most parts are not accessible. No return to (sub)main page/menu. No consistency. Unclear color scheme. Not clear. No proper validation. No GUI designs.	Not all parts are accessible. No return to (sub)main page/menu in all pages. Not consistent. Unclear color scheme. Not clear. No proper validation. The GUI was not designed well	Most parts are easily accessible. Some consistency. Acceptable color scheme. Somehow Clear. Some proper validation. Acceptable GUI design.	All parts are easily accessible. Some consistency. Good color scheme. Clear. Good validation. Good GUI design.	All parts are easily accessible. Consistent. Great and smooth color scheme. Clear. All data are validated. Professional and consistent GUI design	**/5**

Testing						**/15**
Unit Tests	No unit tests were written	Few unit tests were written, but covers are low, some are not relevant, and many do not pass.	Some relevant unit tests were written but not enough, and not all pass.	Many unit tests are written, the coverage is good, most of them are relevant and pass.	Unit test cover high percentage of the project functionalities. All of them are relevant and they all pass.	**/10**
Integration & Accept Test	No integration or systematic test.	Integration and acceptance tests are not well written.	Integration and acceptance need improvements in terms of coverage and automation.	Good integration and acceptance test. Automated and covering.	Integration and acceptance are well designed. Results are as expected. Fully automated, and relevant.	**/5**
Documentation:						**/15**
Manual	No manual.	Manual is not easy to read, and does not cover all parts of the project.	Manual is somehow easy to read and understand. Not all parts of the software are explained.	Most parts are cover, and relatively easy to understand.	Manual is easy to read use. All needed information is provided, and it is well designed.	**/5**
SDD	No SDD.	SDD does not follow the standard SDD format.	SDD follows the format, but not all parts are well written.	SDD format was followed. Good organization. Few parts need improvements.	All parts are well written and designed. The organization is good. No suggested comments or improvements.	**/10**
TOTAL						**/100**

[1] multiply by “n” to adjust for the total mark of the category