# Code & Fix

# Meetings

# Documents

# Roles

Owner: Taylor Bailey

Project Manager: Abe

Development Team: Britney, Emily, Claire, Doug, Grace, Jack

Test Team: Frank, Holly, Ingrid, Keith, Larry

I’ll be setting up a development team that will handle pre-development planning and development. The Test team will be handed off finished code to be tested, if code is not suitable for production then it will be passed back to the development team for improvement with specifications on the errors or bugs. Abe is the project manager, he oversees that both the dev and test teams are working together properly and plans next steps for the project.

# Checkpoints

# Reflection

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceptional 100% | Good 90% | Acceptable 70% | Developing 50% | Missing 0% |
| Accuracy 40% | It is completely obvious which development methodology is described. Any knowledgeable person would be able to identify the methodology based on this document. | There is nothing to add and nothing wrong; the development methodology is completely described. One part of the plan may be misclassified as **bold** or *red/italic* | There exists one small problem (factual error or missing component). | There exists one large or multiple small problems (factual errors or missing components). | Large parts of the development methodology are inaccurately described or missing. |
| Application 30% | It is obvious that real thought went into the application (*the red/italic part*) of the plan. | The development methodology is applied to the scenario in an uncontrived way. | Every aspect of the scenario is incorporated into the development methodology. | Large parts of the plan are overly vague, do not appear to be related to the scenario, or do not appear to be related to the development methodology. | No attempt was made to apply the development methodology to the scenario. |
| Reflection 20% | The reflection cuts to the heart of the strengths and weaknesses of the development methodology. | The strengths and weakness of the development methodology are clearly communicated. | One strength and one weakness is mentioned in the reflection. | Little thought or effort was put in the reflection part of the paper. | The reflection part of the paper is missing. |
| Professionalism 10% | The paper is easy to read and ideas are clearly communicated. | Everything is properly cited, there are no grammar or spelling errors, and writing style is "professional." | One instance of a spelling error, grammar error, incomplete citation, overly verbose, poor formatting, or poor writing. | A citation is missing where one is needed (plagiarism alert!). | Gross spelling/grammar errors or other aspects of the writing that make the paper difficult to read. |