Name   Project Inception

Description

Rubric Detail

Levels of Achievement

Criteria	Bigger problems	Some problems	Good	Significantly exceeds expectations
Competitors **Weight 20.00%**	**55 %** No overview of most closely related competitors (apps / web sites); arguments on how project differs from competitors are missing or wrong.	**70 %** Identified some related competitors (apps / web sites); partial arguments on how project differs from competitors.	**85 %** Identified the most closely related competitors (apps / web sites); good arguments on how project differs from competitors.	**100 %** Comprehensive overview of related competitors (apps / web sites); very convincing arguments on how project differs from competitors.
Features **Weight 30.00%**	**55 %** Not clear if project has any new or exciting features; not clear which are the core features; no analysis (user story / use case / screen flow) of core features; no plan on when which features will be implemented.	**70 %** Not clear if project has both new and exciting features; core features identified and partially analyzed (user story / use case / screen flow); plan on when which features will be implemented, but not based on risks.	**85 %** Project has both new and exciting features; core features identified and analyzed (user story / use case / screen flow); plan on when which features will be implemented based on risks.	**100 %** Project has excellent new and exciting features; core features identified and analyzed in depth (user story / use case / screen flow); plan on when which features will be implemented based on risks.
Risks **Weight 20.00%**	**55 %** No list of risks; no plan for how and when to deal with risks.	**70 %** Listed risks seem unrealistic; partial plan for how and when to deal with risks.	**85 %** Good list of risks; good plan for how and when to deal with risks.	**100 %** Realistic and comprehensive list of risks; in-depth plan for how and when to deal with risks.

	Levels of Achievement			
Criteria	**Bigger problems**	**Some problems**	**Good**	**Significantly exceeds expectations**
Document style **Weight 30.00%**	**55 %** Without the authors present an external reviewer would only understand very little from the documents; all used 3rd-party material (visuals, text, code, etc.) is referenced at the end but not cited correctly within a document.	**70 %** Without the authors present an external reviewer would only understand about half of the documents; an external reviewer would find the documents to be unnecessarily complicated -- the information contained in the documents could be conveyed much more clearly; all used 3rd-party material (visuals, text, code, etc.) is fully cited.	**85 %** Without the authors present an external reviewer would understand almost all of the documents; the information contained in the documents is conveyed clearly; all used 3rd-party material (visuals, text, code, etc.) is fully cited.	**100 %** Without the authors present an external reviewer would easily understand all of the documents; the information contained in the documents is conveyed exceptionally clearly; all used 3rd-party material (visuals, text, code, etc.) is fully cited.

View Associated Items

Print   Close Window