

5911 User Demo Grading Rubric

(Based on CSE ABET Rubric)

Course number: CSE 5911

Instructor: Felix

Semester, Section:

Project: Eviction

Student team:

Date:

Corp Client: FCMUNICOURT

Sponsor:

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Points |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---------------|
| Problem Formulation | Unclear formulation; relation to original requirements not mentioned, nor changes in scope. | Mostly clear but relation to original requirements and/or rationale for changes in scope not clear. | Satisfactory formulation; Relation to client's original requirements, changes in scope and rationale thereof mostly clear with some gaps. | Excellent problem formulation; Relation to client's original requirements and changes in the scope, if any, explained and justified. | 3 |
| Comment: | emphasise the problem in a way that your product is solving it. | | | | |
| Design Approach | Poor design; No exploration of alternative approaches; No attention to effective use of resources. | Some attention to alternative design approaches but not a careful analysis of their advantages/disadvantages; Team picked an approach based on superficial comparisons. | Careful consideration of alternative design approaches and their resource requirements; Not all trade-offs fully analyzed. | Thorough consideration and evaluation of a good set of design approaches; Careful analysis of resource requirements of each and the resulting trade-offs; Where appropriate, client's input sought before making final choice. | 3.5 |
| Comment: | make the table highlight the important parts. | | | | |
| Implementation (including | Not even basic consideration | Limited amount of attention to memory and other | Careful attention to memory and other | Meticulous attention to resource usage and to | |

5911 User Demo Grading Rubric

(Based on CSE ABET Rubric)

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| resource considerations, testing approach, adherence to standards, etc. If implementation is incomplete, assess based on current state.) | of memory and other resource requirements; System is very buggy. No systematic testing, nor use of standard approaches/processes such as agile. | resource usage; Team has followed a standard (agile/ waterfall/ ...) process but not consistently. Team has put some effort into systematic testing but some bugs remain | resource usage and how system might scale with increased demand for services; The team adopted and mostly followed a standard process in its work; The team used a systematic approach to testing and the system seems bug-free. | user interface factors; Has ensured that system can evolve to deal with increased demand for services. Team has consistently followed a standard process in its work. Adopted a suitable testing approach, followed it systematically, and thoroughly tested the system. Client involved at all appropriate points. | 4 |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|

Comment:

good design changes for UX. Will you implement e2ee?

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| Other Factors (use of professional tools, security considerations, ethical issues.) | Little attention paid to factors beyond minimal functional requirements; No systematic use of professional tools; Ethical issues related to system and impact on society not considered. | Some use of common tools seen in earlier courses; Modest effort to ensure basic reliability and security properties; Mostly ignored ethical issues and potential impact on society of systems of this kind. | Good use of professional tools going beyond ones previously seen; System designed to be reliable/ secure under normal operation and under stress; Some consideration of impact of system on society including potential harm system may cause in some situations. | Excellent use of professional tools and systems, identified by careful research; Detailed analysis of security holes with implementation designed to deal with ones that can be reasonably handled and documentation of rest; Analysis of ethical issues related to system and its impact on society including implications of ACM/IEEE Code as it applies to the system, in consultation with client. | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|

Comment:

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Effectiveness as a project team | Dysfunctional team; members blamed each | Team functioned at minimal level of | Generally effective team; Embers interested in | Very effective team; Team members went out | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|

5911 User Demo Grading Rubric

(Based on CSE ABET Rubric)

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|-----|
| | other for problems in project; Team spirit completely lacking. | effectiveness; Members concentrated on distinct parts of system without concern for impact on other members' work. In presentations, individual members did not make any attempt to help other members address audience questions. | presenting a positive picture of the team's work; Members helped each other during team presentations. Team members had a general idea of other members' work. | of the way to describe how each member contributed to various aspects of project. Team worked as a cohesive unit during presentations, with members seamlessly handing over the conversation from one to another to answer questions etc. | 3.5 |
| Comment: good practice git branching model with distribution of tasks. | | | | | |
| Effectiveness of written communication (presentation slides, associated docs) | Documentation consisted of little more than (poorly commented) system code; Hardly any mention of system's scope, design rationale, implementation choices, etc. | Documentation mostly effective at conveying main aspects of project including scope and design/ implementation choices (but not the rationale behind the choices); Skimpy user manual; Information future teams may need to evolve system lacking | Team's documentation clearly presented all important aspects of project: original scope, changes made, implementation choices, processes used etc. Test scripts and important parts of code explained; Lessons learned were summarized; Well-written user manual. | Excellent documentation; Project's original scope, design choices, relevant code details, processes and tools used, and test scripts all described in a structured and integrated manner; Information to enable future designers to evolve system included; Well-designed user manual provided all necessary information; Illustrations, graphics, and layout executed to excellent effect. | 3 |
| Comment: way too much text on slides. Visualise problems instead of wall of text. The updated UX changes were good. Nice integration of demo | | | | | |
| Effectiveness of oral communication | Presentations not effective; Failed to present information about some essential | Presentations adequate at conveying main ideas behind project including design choices etc. but not | Presentations were well done and presented all important aspects of project; Team explained | Team's presentations were polished, informative and engaging. | |

5911 User Demo Grading Rubric (Based on CSE ABET Rubric)

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| | aspects of project; Team members ineffective in responding to even simple questions. | engaging or inspiring. Team responded appropriately to specific questions about specific aspects of project but some responses were unclear. | rationale behind its choices and summarized important lessons learned; Responses to questions were reasonable although some went into too much technical detail, compromising their effectiveness. | In answering questions, the team provided the right level and type of detail for questions ranging from implementation detail to test methodology to future evolution of project. | 3 |
| Comment: | | | | | |

Specific to Agile User Demos

Product backlog

Release burn-up

RTM

Ran regression test suite

Defect trend chart

Minutes (today's sponsor mtg)

General Comments: