**Explanation of Evaluation**

For most of the course, students are evaluated together within their teams. As such, a student’s grade rises and falls as tethered to team diligence and effort. Students would be the first to point out this is not fair.

In the interest of fairness to individual effort in contrast to team members’ efforts, this grading assessment seeks to evaluate a student’s individual contribution. As stated in the course syllabus, the self-evaluation factors into account:

1. Quality (more so than quantity) of GitHub commits
2. Successful and timely completion of features according to XP methodology

The first captures purely individual effort. The second assesses how good of a teammate the student was in terms of the participation, punctuality, and leadership needed to complete features in a timely fashion.

What follows is the instructor’s evaluation of these factors as well as a direct response to the student’s evaluation in terms of the student evaluation’s thoughtfulness and reflection on the semester’s events. In other words, the grade obtained through this self-evaluation exercise is based partly on how honest the student is and partly on the student’s actual individual work during the semester.

**Student:**

**Review Period:** Final

**Reflection on Work – 10 points**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary – 10 | Proficient – 8 | Marginal – 6 | Unacceptable – 0 |
| Student addresses quality, completeness, and timeliness of work. Specific contributions are noted in a way that is easily traceable. | Student addresses quality, completeness, and timeliness of work. Some contributions are noted in a way that is traceable. | Student addresses some attributes of their work (quality, completeness, and timeliness). One or two contributions are noted. | Student fails to address attributes of their work. Contributions are not adequately support. |

**Your score:**

**Comments:**

**Reflection on Qualities – 10 points**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary – 10 | Proficient – 8 | Marginal – 6 | Unacceptable – 0 |
| Student enumerates several qualities as they apply to the project. Qualities are observable in the context of the semester with examples given. | Student enumerates several qualities that are observable in the context of the semester. Examples may be truncated. | Student provides a limited set of qualities. The qualities may be difficult to observe. Examples are limited or nonexistent. | Student fails to articulate qualities that applied to the project. |

**Your score:**

**Comments:**

**Reflection on Technical Abilities – 10 points**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary – 10 | Proficient – 8 | Marginal – 6 | Unacceptable – 0 |
| Student enumerates several technical abilities as they apply to the project. Qualities are observable in the context of the semester with examples given. | Student enumerates several technical abilities that are observable in the context of the semester. Examples may be truncated. | Student provides a limited set of technical abilities. These abilities may be difficult to observe. Examples are limited or nonexistent. | Student fails to articulate technical abilities that applied to the project. |

**Your score:**

**Comments:**

**Personal Attribute Ratings and Further Comments – 10 points**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary – 10 | Proficient – 8 | Marginal - 6 | Unacceptable - 0 |
| Student gives adequate rationale for each rating, and the rationale can be verified. | Student gives adequate rationale for most ratings, and the rationale can be verified. | Student gives adequate rationale for some ratings, and/or the rationale cannot be verified or conflicts with observed behavior. | Student fails to give adequate rationale for each rating, and/or rationale cannot be verified or conflicts with observed behavior |

**Your score:**

**Comments:**

**Instructor Evaluation of Individual Programming – 30 points**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary – 30 | Proficient – 24 | Marginal – 18 | Unacceptable – 0 |
| Student made adequate commits, either solo or while paired. There is evidence the student was engaged in pair programming throughout the semester. | Student made adequate commits, either solo or while paired. There is evidence the student was engaged in pair programming more often than not during the semester. | Student made few commits but there is some documented evidence they contributed to pair programming. | Student made few commits, and there is no documented evidence they contributed to pair programming. |

**Your score:**

**Comments:**

**Instructor Evaluation of Teamwork – 30 points**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary – 30 | Proficient – 24 | Marginal – 18 | Unacceptable – 0 |
| Student participated with teammates both in and out of class. Student’s performance as PM resulted in completion of features and an exceptionally well-maintained GitHub repository. Student arrived on-time and attended all classes and team meetings, and any exceptions were communicated ahead of time. | Student participated with teammates in class and (perhaps to a slightly lesser degree) out of class. Student performed well as PM during the sprints, with minimal exceptions and minor communication lapses. Student arrived on-time and attended all classes and team meetings, and any exceptions were communicated ahead of time. | Student participated with teammates in class and (perhaps to a slightly lesser degree) out of class. Student served as PM but PR’s and Wiki were poorly managed. Student may have had one or two late arrivals or absences, but each exception was communicated to team and instructor. | Student participation wavered, either in class or outside of class during team meetings. Other students needed to step in when student was the assigned PM. Student was routinely late or absent and failed to notify team and instructor. |

**Your score:**

**Comments:**

**Overall Score:**