| | *poor (bottom 30%)* | *insufficient (30%)* | *good (30%)* | *super excellent (top 10%)* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rubric | 0 points | 1 point | 2 points | 3 points | |
| | | | | | |
| **Team Performance (D1.0)** | | | | | |
| Use of issues | 0 to 2 | 2 to 4 | 5 to 7 | (1) All communication via well-structured issues; (2) People respond to issues; (3) Pull requests solve issues; (4) Issues closed after they're done; (5) At least 10 issues; (6) use of task lists in selected issues. (7) Good use of labels; (8) issues assigned | |
| Use of pull requests | | >= 2 | >= 5 | (0) At least 10 merged pull requests (1) All .md via pull rqeuests; (2) PRs are reviewed (majority has >= 1 comment); (3) PRs contain coherent units; (4) PRs are well described; (5) Reference issue; (6) no self merges. | |
| Git branching | More than one commit to master | 1-2 point | 3-4 points | All of (1) Clear branches / network structure; (2) good handling / avoiding of conflicts; (3) no commits to master; (4) branches closed; (5) branch names | |
| Git commit messages | 25% of commits has meaningless message like update foo.md | For 50% of commits one of the two points | For 50% most recent commits all points | For all commits (1) Short title + explanations (2) Commits tell a story. | |
| Repo understandability | | | | README.md gives good pointers; issues + PRs give good overview; Repository is well organized | |
| Planning | | no milestones, but clear issues; or milestone without issues | milestone for current devlierable only | Use of milestones with assigned issues, and clear distribution of work. All deliverables scheduled. Current milestone closed. Meetings announced and minutes recorded in  e.g. issues. | |
| Journal | | 1 of 3 | 2 of 3 | (0) Compelling, concise and clear. (1) Hours per person + (2) indication of what has been done. (3) hours for all weeks. (4) Honest. | |
| Distribution of work | | < 14h, unequal distribution of work | evenly distributed effort, but < 14h | All team members spend >= 14 hours per week and activily participate | Strong deviations: Ask |
| Language/Communication | no use of slack | | poor slack communication | Clear, constructive, and understandable communication via github. Grammatically correct sentences with punctuation; they use slack to exchange information | |
| Release | | just git tag | git release + tag | git tag + described release + reference to all issues in milestone + files attached + in time | |
| Team Description | data missing | poor data | all data | complete with pictures | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Stakeholders (D1.1)** | | | | | |
| Issue analysis | | >= 10 analyzed, but superficially | >= 10 interesting issues analyzed, but superficially | >= 10 rich and diverse issues analyzed; each covered in depth | |
| PR analysis | | >= 10 analyzed, but superficially | >= 10 interesting PRs analyzed, but superficially | >= 10 rich and diverse pull requests analyzed, each covered in depth. | |
| R&W stakeholders identified | | Only ones that apply are discussed | all categories of R&W addressed, but superficially | all categories of R&W thoroughly addressed | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Other stakeholders identified | | 1 or 2 described | >= 3 superficially described | >= 3 additional categories meaningfully described, or compelling explanation why this is not needed | |
| Stakeholder involvement | | 1 | 2 | (1) explain what sort of stakeholders are involved, (2) what their interest in the system is, (3) and how they are trying to influence the development of the system, e.g., though Stakeholder power interest grid | |
| Integrators identified | | named | named, and challenges or strategies | (1) integrators named; (2) challenges identified; (3) merge decision strategies named | |
| Contact persons identified | | 1 person | 2 persons | >= 3 persons to be contacted | |
| Sources used indicated | | PRs + issues mentioned, but not more | PRs + issues + some documentation | Clear where *all* information comes from | |
| Well structured document | | Acceptable structure | Well structured, but lengthy. | intro; conclusions; overview of all stakeholders; discussion per stakeholder; tradeoffs. To the point | |
| Well written document | | <= 1 typos per 50 words | <= 1 error per 100 words | <= 1 error per 200 words | (Just inspect sample) |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Context View (D1.2)** | | | | | |
| Scope / Responsibilities | | Only one mentioned | Scope & responsibilitiies both mentioned, but superficially | Scope & responsibilities clearly articulated. Perhaps some history? | |
| External entities | | Some relevant external entities covered | Most relevant external entities covered | Systems, organizations, external data, explicitly listed | |
| External interfaces | | some. | most. | Interfaces explicitly discussed | |
| Stakeholders | | stakeholders are referenced/shown in context view | | Context view and stakeholder connections are well explained | |
| Relevant context diagram | | acceptable diagram, no explanation | acceptable diagram, with explanation | Appealing diagram, addresses key entities, explained in text; legend | |
| Sources used indicated | | Just some url's at the end | PRs + issues + some documentation | Clear where *all* information comes from, in line links | |
| Well structured document | | Acceptable structure | Well structured, but lengthy. | intro; conclusions; key content properly connected to each other. To the point. | |
| Well written document | | <= 1 typos per 50 words | <= 1 error per 100 words | <= 1 error per 200 words | (Just inspect sample) |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Development View (D2.1)** | | | | | |
| Relevant Diagram(s) | | 1 reasonable diagram | 1 good diagram | Illustration with two or more relevant (generated, reused, or self-created documents) | |
| Component overview / module structure | | Key modules covered, no dependencies | Key modules, superficial dependency analysis | Key modules (or packages, components) covered,  their dependencies, and their organization (e.g. layers) | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common design models | | | | Relevant common approaches covered. Processing (internationalizaiton, initialization, logging, ...); pattern usage; common software | |
| Codeline models / dev process | | directory structure shown | discussion of test and dev process. | Mapping of components to code level organization; build and test processes | |
| Document quality | | Acceptable document | Good document | Excellent document; Well structured, sources mentioned, good grammar + spelling | |
| Technical debt | | | | | |
| Contribution file & journal | no contribution files and < 14 hours on average | | | Amazing contribution file + clear journal + all > 14 hours on average | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **D3: Variability Perspective** | | | | | |
| Identification | | just list | list + superficial | 20 features or really good ones and explanation + key characteristics | |
| Technical description | | | (2/3) or superficial | dependencies + conflicts + binding time | |
| Implementation strategy | | | only configurability | Configurability (design patterns, config files) + implementation details | |
| FeatureIDE model | | Only diagram | Diagram + weak explanation | Diagram + explanation | |
| Evolution history | | | 2/3 or superficial | variability mechanism + configurable features + analysis of issues/PRs | |
| Document quality | | Acceptable document | Good document | Excellent document; Well structured, sources mentioned, good grammar + spelling | |
| | | | | | |
| **Contributions** | | | | | |
| Quality of the contribution | 0-2: Nothing useful | 3-6: Contribution to documentation only | 7-8: Nice code contribution | 9-10: Amazing code contribution | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Review** | | | | | |
| Review | -1: didn't do it | 0: did it, but wasn't good (very short, doesn't contain summary, observation, strenghts and weaknesess, recomendation to teachers | 1: did everything | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Final chapter** | | | | | |
| Improved previous deliverables | | it is just the same section | they did minor improvement | they followed all our suggestions and the section is shiny now | |
| New perspective and viewpoint | don't have it | did it, bad very bad | did it, as expected | well detailed and interesting | |
| Document quality | | Acceptable document | Good document | Excellent document; Well structured, sources mentioned, good grammar + spelling | |
| Team performance | were bad and did not improve at all | were bad and did minor improvements | were ok and kept ok | improved a lot; were already good and kept this way | |
| Personal opinion | | | | You can give up to 3 points as personal opinion | |