# CST-326 RUBRIC: Benchmark – Final Project: Technical Report

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CRITERIA | % | **Unsatisfactory** | **Less Than Satisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Proficient** | **Exemplary** |
|  |  | 0% | 65% | 75% | 85% | 100% |
| **Content – 66%** | | | | | | |
| **Evaluation of Project Quality** (including how feedback from the client is incorporated into the project and how it should be addressed in future revisions) | 12% | Discussion of the project quality is not present. | Discussion of the project quality is incomplete or vague. | Discussion of the project quality is provided, but is superficial and lacking detail. | Discussion of the project quality is complete, including implications for future revision based on client feedback. | Discussion of the project quality is comprehensive, detailed, and complete, including implications for future revision based on client feedback. |
| **How your CLC Group's process would change if it were part of an Enterprise Level** | 11% | Discussion of Agile development is not present. | Discussion of Agile development is incomplete or vague. | Discussion of Agile development is provided, but is superficial and lacking detail. | Discussion of Agile development is complete. | Discussion of Agile development is comprehensive, detailed, and complete. Discussion is appropriately at an enterprise level. |
| **Summary of Testing Methods** (including why to create and apply testing methods) | 12% | Discussion of testing methods is not present. | Discussion of testing methods is incomplete or vague. | Discussion of testing methods is provided, but is superficial and lacking detail. | Discussion of testing methods is comprehensive, detailed, and complete. | Discussion of testing methods is comprehensive, detailed, and complete. Discussion is connected to implications of the project moving forward. |
| **How the Quality of your CLC Project was evaluated** | 11% | Discussion of quality evaluation is not present. | Discussion of quality evaluation is incomplete or vague. | Discussion of quality evaluation is provided, but is superficial and lacking detail. | Discussion of quality evaluation is complete. | Discussion of quality evaluation is comprehensive, detailed, and complete. Discussion is connected to implications of the project moving forward. |
| **Evaluation of the Agile Project Management Process the Team Used to Make Recommendations for Changes to Future Projects** | 12% | An evaluation of the Agile project management process the team used is not present. | An evaluation of the Agile project management process the team used is incomplete or omits some requirements stated in the assignment criteria. | An evaluation of the Agile project management process the team used is provided, but is superficial and lacking detail. | An evaluation of the Agile project management process the team used is complete. | An evaluation of the Agile project management process the team used is comprehensive, detailed, and complete. The evaluation is connected to implications of the project moving forward. |
| **Discussion of Technological Literacy Skills Needed to Complete Project (C2.1)** | 12% | A discussion of technological literacy skills necessary to design components of information systems solutions is not present. | A discussion of technological literacy skills necessary to design components of information systems solutions is incomplete or omits some requirements stated in the assignment criteria. | A discussion of technological literacy skills necessary to design components of information systems solutions is provided, but is superficial and lacking detail. | A discussion of technological literacy skills necessary to design components of information systems solutions is complete. | A discussion of technological literacy skills necessary to design components of information systems solutions is comprehensive, detailed, and complete. Discussion is connected to implications of the project moving forward. |
| **Incorporation of Christian Worldview** | 10% | Discussion of how the Christian worldview was incorporated is not present. | Discussion of how the Christian worldview was incorporated is incomplete or vague. | Discussion of how the Christian worldview is incorporated is provided, but is superficial and lacking detail. | Discussion of how the Christian worldview is incorporated is complete. | Discussion of how the Christian worldview is incorporated is comprehensive, detailed, and complete. |
| **Organization and Effectiveness – 30%** | | | | | | |
| **Thesis Development and Purpose** | 10% | Paper lacks any discernible overall purpose or organizing claim. | Thesis and/or main claim are insufficiently developed and/or vague; purpose is not clear. | Thesis and/or main claim are apparent and appropriate to purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are clear and forecast the development of the paper. It is descriptive and reflective of the arguments and appropriate to the purpose. | Thesis and/or main claim are comprehensive; contained within the thesis is the essence of the paper. Thesis statement makes the purpose of the paper clear. |
| **Paragraph Development and Transitions** | 10% | Paragraphs and transitions consistently lack unity and coherence. No apparent connections between paragraphs are established. Transitions are inappropriate to purpose and scope. Organization is disjointed. | Some paragraphs and transitions may lack logical progression of ideas, unity, coherence, and/or cohesiveness. Some degree of organization is evident. | Paragraphs are generally competent, but ideas may show some inconsistency in organization and/or in their relationships to each other. | A logical progression of ideas between paragraphs is apparent. Paragraphs exhibit a unity, coherence, and cohesiveness. Topic sentences and concluding remarks are appropriate to purpose. | There is a sophisticated construction of paragraphs and transitions. Ideas progress and relate to each other. Paragraph and transition construction guide the reader. Paragraph structure is seamless. |
| **Mechanics of Writing** (includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, language use) | 10% | Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice and/or sentence construction are used. | Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language and/or word choice are present. Sentence structure is correct, but not varied. | Some mechanical errors or typos are present, but are not overly distracting to the reader. Correct and varied sentence structure and audience-appropriate language are employed. | Prose is largely free of mechanical errors, although a few may be present. The writer uses a variety of effective sentence structures and figures of speech. | Writer is clearly in command of standard, written, academic English. |
| **Format – 4%** | | | | | | |
| **Paper Format** (use of appropriate style for the major and assignment) | 2% | APA is not used appropriately or documentation format is rarely followed correctly. | APA is used, but some elements are missing or mistaken; lack of control with formatting is apparent. | APA is used and formatting is correct, although some minor errors may be present. | APA is fully used; There are virtually no errors in formatting style. | All format elements are correct. |
| **Research Citations** (in-text citations for paraphrasing and direct quotes, and reference page listing and formatting, as appropriate to assignment) | 2% | No reference page is included. No citations are used. | Reference page is present. Citations are inconsistently used. Minimum number of scholarly sources is not met. | Reference page is included and lists sources used in the paper. Sources are appropriately documented, although some errors may be present. Minimum number of sources has been met. | Reference page is present and fully inclusive of all cited sources. Documentation is appropriate and APA is usually correct. Minimum number of sources has been met. | In-text citations and a reference page are complete. The documentation of cited sources is free of errors. Minimum number of sources has been met. |

**Comments:**