	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Requirements Specification and Code Wireframes (20%)	• Inaccurate • Missing • Poor grasp of requirements specification • No code wireframes.	• Maybe numbered use cases • Lacking some use cases • Doesn't follow the template. • Inconsistently demonstrates the application of requirements specification. • No code wireframes.	• As per excellent but w/ inconsistencies • Demonstrates the application of requirements specification	• Numbered use cases • Comprehensive use cases • Follows the template. • Clearly demonstrates the application of requirements specification • Code wireframes define most of application functional units. • Code wireframes are well modularized.
	0%	10%	15%	20%
Mockups and Storyboard (20%)	• Missing or completely inconsistent. • Demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of UI mockups and storyboards.	•Inconsistency in some storyboards •Some mockups are missing. •Covers some use cases, but not all. •Displays questionable understanding of storyboarding	• As per excellent but w/ inconsistencies. • Storyboards cover all use cases. • Mockups are mostly complete. • Some execution paths are missing in the storyboard. • Lacking in some aspect that does not denote excellence.	• Consistent storyboards • Mockups are complete. • Storyboards cover all use cases and their execution path. • Displays understanding of storyboarding • Fine-details might be missing.
	0%	10%	15%	20%
High-level Design (15%)	• Poor diagrams.	• Unclear separation of concerns. • Important entities missing • Inconsistent diagrams	• Clearly sketches important entities. • Some inconsistency. • Some concerns are not separated. • Diagrams don't follow a key.	• Clearly sketches important entities from a high-level perspective and their interaction. • Clear separation of concerns. • Diagrams well labeled. • Diagrams follow a well defined key. • Diagrams can be high-level.
	0%	5%	12%	15%
Release Planning (20%)	• Lack of planning • Issues are not in the issue tracker.	• Unrealistic planning or lack of planning (Gantt chart). • Issues are not in the issue tracker. • Only high-level issues.	• Obvious planning with inconsistency (Gantt chart). • Issues are in the issue tracker but they are not assigned.	• Clear planning (Gantt chart) • Realistic / Achievable • Issues are in the issue tracker and there is someone assigned to all of them. • Issues are as detailed as possible.
	0%	5%	15%	20%
Project Overview (15%)	• Lacking of glossary or cursory effort.	• Important domain ideas missing. • More than 2 elements are missing or of bad quality.	• Like excellent but missing 1 element or bad quality in 1 or 2 elements.	• Project Description is clear and concrete • Clear glossary. • List of similar products. • External references
	0%	5%	10%	15%
Weekly Meetings and Demos (10%)	• As per satisfactory but team is mostly late. • Demos and progress reports in meetings are not prepared or well organized.	• Team is mostly on time. • Team addresses little feedback each week. • There is progress each week but it is not substantial. • Team doesn't showcase its progress effectively in demos and meetings.	• Team is on time. • Team asks insightful questions. • Team addresses some feedback each week. • Team shows continued progress each week but it is not substantial. • Take home messages in meetings and demos are sometimes missing.	• Team is on time. • Team asks insightful questions. • Team addresses feedback each week. • Team shows substantial progress each week. • Team effectively communicates its progress each week and highlights take home messages for client / TA.
	1%	5%	8%	10%

Sprint 2 - Evaluation Rubric

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Requirement Specification -Revised (5%)	• Inaccurate • Missing • Poor grasp of requirements specification	• As per excellent but inconsistency exists • Old use cases that required improvement have not been improved.	• As per Excellent but w/ inconsistencies	• New use cases are: numbered - comprehensive • New use cases are specified in the template. • Old use cases that required improvement have been improved.
	0%	0%	3%	5%
Mockups and Storyboard - Revised (5%)	• Missing or completely inconsistent. • Demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of mockups and storyboards.	•Inconsistency in some storyboards •Some mockups are missing. •Covers some use cases, but not all. •Story boards do not reflect new or modified use cases. •Displays questionable understanding of storyboarding	• Storyboards reflect new/modified use cases. • Mockups reflect new/modified use cases. • Story board reflects most use cases. • Mockups are detailed but are inconsistent • Some execution paths are missing in the storyboard.	• Storyboards reflect new/modified use cases. • Mockups reflect new/modified use cases. • Displays understanding of storyboarding • Mockups are portrayed in high-detail. • Story board reflects all use cases and their execution path.
	0%	0%	3%	5%
Detailed Design (25%)	• Poor diagrams. • Demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of architectural views.	• Unclear separation of concerns. • Important entities missing • One of the views is missing.	• As per excellent but some inconsistency • Concerns are not properly separated. • Diagrams don't follow a key.	• Clearly models important entities. • Clear separation of concerns. • Diagrams well labeled. • Module view, allocation view, and component-and-connector view are present.
	0%	5%	15%	25%
Codebase (30%)	• Missing or useless. • Doesn't compile / run • Not demoable.	• Poor code quality. • Poor modularization. • Low cohesion. • Poor in-line documentation. • Poor code organization (files) • Somehow demoable, buggy.	• Some inconsistency. • High cohesion and modularization. • Good organization (file level) • Planned use cases are demoable. • Some in-line documentation.	• High cohesion and modularization. • Good organization (file level) • Planned use cases are demoable. (tests count as backend demo) • Good in-line documentation.
	0%	5%	20%	30%
Tests (10%)	• No tests	• Some tests but not enough to satisfy all expected demoable use cases.	• As per excellent/ • Tests exist and run but some inconsistency.	• Tests exist and run. • Test cover use cases expected. • Unit testing and/or scripts for backend.
	0%	5%	10%	15%
Meetings, Tracking and Demos (10%)	• As per satisfactory but team is mostly late. • Demos and progress reports in meetings are not prepared or well organized.	• Team is mostly on time. • Team addresses little feedback each week. • There is progress each week but it is not substantial. • Team doesn't showcase its progress effectively in demos and meetings. • Poor use of the issue tracker.	• Team is on time. • Team asks insightful questions. • Team addresses some feedback each week. • Team shows continued progress each week but it is not substantial. • Take home messages in meetings and demos are sometimes missing. • The issue tracker is somehow actively used, there are no substantial conversations.	• Team is on time. • Team asks insightful questions. • Team addresses feedback each week. • Team shows substantial progress each week. • Team effectively communicates its progress each week and highlights take home messages for client / TA. • The issue tracker is actively used including issue conversations and messages.
	1%	5%	8%	10%
Wildcard (15%)	The wildcard percentage will be assigned to one or multiple items in the rubric (entirely or split between many items) depending on the life-cycle of each project. *Example #1:* if the client introduces several- or heavily modifies- requirements in this sprint, the TA will assign the wildcard percentage to the *requirement specification* and the *user interface* items to reflect the team's additional effort updating the documentation.			

Sprint 3 - Evaluation Rubric

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Requirement Specification -Revised (5%)	• Inaccurate • Missing • Poor grasp of requirements specification	• As per excellent but inconsistency exists • Old use cases that required improvement have not been improved.	• As per Excellent but w/ inconsistencies	• New use cases are: numbered - comprehensive • New use cases are specified in the template. • Old use cases that required improvement have been improved.
	0%	0%	3%	5%
Mockups and Storyboard (Revised) (5%)	• Missing or completely inconsistent. • Demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of mockups and storyboards.	•Inconsistency in some storyboards •Some mockups are missing. •Covers some use cases, but not all. •Story boards do not reflect new or modified use cases. •Displays questionable understanding of storyboarding	• Storyboards reflect new/modified use cases. • Mockups reflect new/modified use cases. • Story board reflects most use cases. • Mockups are detailed but are inconsistent • Some execution paths are missing in the storyboard.	• Storyboards reflect new/modified use cases. • Mockups reflect new/modified use cases. • Displays understanding of storyboarding • Mockups are portrayed in high-detail. • Story board reflects all use cases and their execution path. • Storyboards and Mockups are synchronized with the current prototype.
	0%	2%	3%	5%
Detailed Design (10%)	• Feedback hasn't been addressed.	• Feedback has been addressed. • Diagrams are not synchronized with the codebases.	• As per excellent but some inconsistency • Feedback has been addressed.	• Diagrams have been updated with new design decisions that reflect a higher understanding of the problem and technologies used to solve it. • Diagrams are synchronized with the codebases. • Feedback has been addressed.
	0%	2%	5%	10%
Codebase (35%)	• Missing or useless. • Doesn't compile / run • Not demoable.	• Poor code quality. • Poor modularization. • Low cohesion. • Poor in-line documentation. • Poor code organization (files) • Somehow demoable, buggy.	• Some inconsistency. • High cohesion and modularization. • Good organization (file level) • Planned use cases are demoable. • Some in-line documentation.	• High cohesion and modularization. • Good organization (file level) • Planned use cases are demoable. (tests count as backend demo) • Good in-line documentation.
	0%	5%	20%	35%
Tests (20%)	• No tests	• Some tests but not enough to satisfy.	• As per excellent/ • Tests exist and run but some inconsistency.	• Tests exist and run. • Test cover use cases expected. • Unit testing and/or scripts for backend.
	0%	5%	15%	20%
Meetings, Tracking and Demos (10%)	• As per satisfactory but team is mostly late. • Demos and progress reports in meetings are not prepared or well organized.	• Team is mostly on time. • Team addresses little feedback each week. • There is progress each week but it is not substantial. • Team doesn't showcase its progress effectively in demos and meetings. • Poor use of the issue tracker.	• Team is on time. • Team asks insightful questions. • Team addresses some feedback each week. • Team shows continued progress each week but it is not substantial. • Take home messages in meetings and demos are sometimes missing. • The issue tracker is somehow actively used, there are no substantial conversations.	• Team is on time. • Team asks insightful questions. • Team addresses feedback each week. • Team shows substantial progress each week. • Team effectively communicates its progress each week and highlights take home messages for client / TA. • The issue tracker is actively used including issue conversations and messages.
	1%	5%	8%	10%
Wildcard (15%)	The wildcard percentage will be assigned to one or multiple items in the rubric (entirely or split between many items) depending on the life-cycle of each project.			

Sprint 4 - Evaluation Rubric

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Requirement Specification -Revised (5%)	• Inaccurate • Missing • Poor grasp of requirements specification	• As per excellent but inconsistency exists • Old use cases that required improvement have not been improved.	• As per Excellent but w/ inconsistencies	• New use cases are: numbered - comprehensive • New use cases are specified in the template. • Old use cases that required improvement have been improved.
	0%	0%	3%	5%
Mockups and Storyboard -Revised (5%)	• Missing or completely inconsistent. • Demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of mockups and storyboards.	•Inconsistency in some storyboards •Some mockups are missing. •Covers some use cases, but not all. •Story boards do not reflect new or modified use cases. •Displays questionable understanding of storyboarding	• Storyboards reflect new/modified use cases. • Mockups reflect new/modified use cases. • Story board reflects most use cases. • Mockups are detailed but are inconsistent • Some execution paths are missing in the storyboard.	• Storyboards reflect new/modified use cases. • Mockups reflect new/modified use cases. • Displays understanding of storyboarding • Mockups are portrayed in high-detail. • Story board reflects all use cases and their execution path. • Storyboards and Mockups are synchronized with the current prototype.
	0%	2%	3%	5%
Deployment Environment and Documentation (10%)	• Missing or completely inconsistent.	• Documentation is provided by has a lack of details. •Security defaults have not been changed.	• As per Excellent but w/ inconsistencies	• Deployment documentation: backend/frontend • List of required software with install details • The final prototype is deployed and functional. • Security defaults have been changed.
	0%	2%	5%	10%
Codebase (35%)	• Missing or useless. • Doesn't compile / run • Not demoable.	• Poor code quality. • Poor modularization. • Low cohesion. • Poor in-line documentation. • Poor code organization (files) • Somehow demoable, buggy.	• Some inconsistency. • High cohesion and modularization. • Good organization (file level) • Planned use cases are demoable. • Some in-line documentation.	• High cohesion and modularization. • Good organization (file level) • Planned use cases are demoable. (tests count as backend demo) • Good in-line documentation.
	0%	5%	20%	35%
Tests (20%)	• No tests	• Some tests but not enough to satisfy.	• As per excellent/ • Tests exist and run but some inconsistency.	• Tests exist and run. • Test cover use cases expected. • Unit testing and/or scripts for backend.
	0%	5%	15%	20%
Meetings, Tracking and Demos (10%)	• As per satisfactory but team is mostly late. • Demos and progress reports in meetings are not prepared or well organized.	• Team is mostly on time. • Team addresses little feedback each week. • There is progress each week but it is not substantial. • Team doesn't showcase its progress effectively in demos and meetings. • Poor use of the issue tracker.	• Team is on time. • Team asks insightful questions. • Team addresses some feedback each week. • Team shows continued progress each week but it is not substantial. • Take home messages in meetings and demos are sometimes missing. • The issue tracker is somehow actively used, there are no substantial conversations.	• Team is on time. • Team asks insightful questions. • Team addresses feedback each week. • Team shows substantial progress each week. • Team effectively communicates its progress each week and highlights take home messages for client / TA. • The issue tracker is actively used including issue conversations and messages.
	1%	5%	8%	10%
Wildcard (15%)	The wildcard percentage will be assigned to one or multiple items in the rubric (entirely or split between many items) depending on the life-cycle of each project.			

When in doubt:

Descriptor	Interpretation
Excellent	Consistently original thinking that extends the material, demonstrated depth and breadth in the material, ability to integrate material with other subjects, ability to analyze and synthesize material at various levels of abstraction.
Good	Like an A, but not consistent over time, or weak in a specific area.
Satisfactory	Understand the core material but not its subtleties, can apply it to simple situations on own and to more complex situations with hints, evidence that the material has changed the way of thinking.
Unsatisfactory	Understand some of the core material but not its subtleties can apply it to simple situations but often needs assistance, evidence that the material has had some change on the way of thinking.
Unsatisfactory	Shows some understanding of parts of the material, cannot apply it without some direction, little evidence that the material has changed the way of thinking.
Unsatisfactory	Little evidence of understanding of even the surface issues, poor analysis and synthesis, inability to apply the material.