|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Case Study Assessment – Scoring Rubric | | | | | |
| Criterion | Unsatisfactory – 1 | Needs Improvement – 2 | Good – 3 | Outstanding – 4 | Expert – 5 |
| Understandability  (Understanding of the case study and to convert the requirements into appropriate implementation) | * The associate has failed to understand the case study. * Implementation doesn’t match the intended purpose of the case study. * The implementation presented doesn’t contain the relevant code targeted for the code-study | * The associate has understood the case-study partially. * Implementation shows some significant lags that are not mentioned in the case study. * Needs to focus on the unsaid requirements of the case study. | * The associate has completely understood the case study. * The implementation is complete but with some minor short-comings. * Needs little more focus on the inside of design | * The associate has understood the case study to the best possible. * Implementation has all the major functionality of the case study. * Minor lags in the implementation are found, but can be ignored | * The associate has shown expertise in understanding the case study and implementing it. * No lags were found in the code. |
| Comments  (code comment are required to understand the purpose of the code) | * No code comments were found in the code. * Harder for a developer to understand the code | * Code has some developer comments. * Information in the comments is not of a great importance | * Code has some significant comments * More details need to be added to the comments to make them useful. | * Code has almost all the comments required. * Some minor lags in the information of the comments are found | * The user has described his code to the best possible way in the form of comments. * No additional inputs are required |
| Installability  (Ability to work on any type of browser is judged in this criteria) | * The implementation is not mature enough to support even a single browser completely * Needs to understand the browser features which are required by the underlying code | * Implementation though not complete is supported on major browsers. * Needs to improve the code to be completely runnable on all the browsers. | * Implementation is quite good to be run on the browsers. * Styling needs to be taken care among the different browsers. | * Implementation is completely portable. * Some minor issues with the code, which can be ignored. | * Code is completely portable on all the browsers. * No changes required to the existing implementation. |
| Layout  (Design features of the web page are evaluate as part of this criteria) | * Implementation has a very bad design to consider it. * Needs to redesign the frontend to make it look better | * Layout is accurate in terms of the elements. * Needs to make it responsive to support all the devices. | * Layout is pretty good in terms of responsiveness. * Needs to avoid hard-coding of the properties | * Layout is excellent in terms of elements and responsiveness. * No changes required to the elements. * Requires some level of improvement in terms of responsiveness | * Layout is perfect to fit into any type of device. * Elements are used correctly. * Responsiveness is the best it can be. |