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Software Engineering Project Presentations Grading Rubric

Instructor: Leonidas Kontothanassis

Student Name(s):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Missing/Unsatisfactory (0) | Satisfactory (1) | Excellent (2) |
| Intro & Proj Scope | Missing team intro, overview, or objectives | Required info is present | Required info is present and presented clearly and convincingly. |
| Requirements | Missing use cases or non-  functional requirements | The five use cases are clearly stated and non-functional requirements provided | The five use cases and the non-functional requirements are clearly explained in a visual and appealing manner |
| Design | Missing class diagram or architecture diagram | Class diagram and architecture diagram provided but are not clearly explained | Class diagram and architecture diagram provided, are clear to read on the slide, and are clearly explained |
| Implementation | Provided information does not help us understand how implementation and testing were done | The development tools and testing process are explained | The development tools and testing process are explained clearly in terms of how they were used in the project, perhaps supported with clear illustrations/screenshots |
| Demo - Use case 1 | Use case not demo’d | Use case demo’d but something broke or workflow of how feature works/what is expected is not clear | Use case clearly demo’d and it worked as expected. |
| Demo - Use case 2 | Use case not demo’d | Use case demo’d but something broke or workflow of how feature works/what is expected is not clear | Use case clearly demo’d and it worked as expected. |
| Demo - Use case 3 | Use case not demo’d | Use case demo’d but something broke or workflow of how feature works/what is expected is not clear | Use case clearly demo’d and it worked as expected. |
| Demo - Use case 4 | Use case not demo’d | Use case demo’d but something broke or workflow of how feature works/what is expected is not clear | Use case clearly demo’d and it worked as expected. |
| Demo - Use case 5 | Use case not demo’d | Use case demo’d but something broke or workflow of how feature works/what is expected is not clear | Use case clearly demo’d and it worked as expected. |
| Conclusion | No conclusive remarks or lesson learned provided | Basic conclusive remarks and shallow lessons learned provided | Basic conclusive remarks and a deep reflection on lessons learned that demonstrate that students understand the challenges of building software systems and what they need to do to further improve their system and software engineering skills. Note that deep != lengthy. |
| Overall Presentation Organization | Presentation has no clear sequence of information. | Presentation has a clear, logical order that audience can follow. | Presentation has a clear, logical, and interesting order that audience can follow. |
| Quality of Slides | Incoherent/illegible slides that no one can understand or are crammed with lots of text. | Slides help the presentation but have small issues. | Slides are clean and aesthetically pleasing and help the presentation. |
| Overall Presentation Quality | Speakers not audible or speak too fast to follow or seems uninterested. | Speakers are well rehearsed but fumbles in some parts. | Speakers are well rehearsed, clearly delivered the talk, and kept captured audience attention through a compelling presentation. |
| Adherence to Time limit | Did not finish within time limit | N/A | Went over time limit. |
| Question Answering | Could not answer posed questions | Provided unconvincing answers | Answered questions in a convincing manner, evidenced by demo-ing things or being able to pull up the parts of code etc. that are relevant |