

Evaluation Results

Author: Bernard Nsabimana Date Evaluated: 11/24/2013 04:57:34 AM (MST) DRF template: CPW1 - IT: Generic Capstone Project (V4 UNDERGRAD-0407) Program: CPW1 - IT: Generic Capstone Pr.(V4 UNDERGRAD-0407)-PA Evaluation Method: Using Rubric
--

Evaluation Summary for Generic Capstone: Project (2007)

Final Score:	3.96 (out of 4)
Overall comments:	A detailed project narrative is included that define the process, goals and results of completing the implementation of the application. The scope of work, process and challenges are presented with significant detail with corresponding exhibits to support the theme of the paper. Good work!

Detailed Results (Rubric used: CAPU - IT: Capstone Project)

Communication Holistic			
(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The work is difficult to follow and is confusing.	The work needs clarification and other revision.	The work is easy to follow and understand.	The work is extremely clear and easy to understand.
Criterion Score: 4.00			
Mechanics (grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc.)			
(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The work contains 5 or more minor errors and some major errors.	The work contains 3-4 minor errors and no major errors.	The work contains 1-2 minor errors and no major errors.	The work contains no minor or major errors.
Criterion Score: 4.00			
Style (word choice, sentence structure, etc.)			
(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The writing style is characterized by poor sentence structure, limited vocabulary, and inappropriate word choice.	The writing style is characterized by some sentence variation, adequate but limited vocabulary, and poor word choice.	The writing style is characterized by varied sentence structure, solid vocabulary, and accurate word choice.	The writing style is characterized by highly varied sentence structure, vivid vocabulary, and accurate word choice.
Criterion Score: 4.00			
A. Cover Sheet			
(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not	The candidate provides a	Not applicable.	The candidate provides a

provide a coversheet with any of the required elements.	coversheet with only 1-3 of the required elements.		coversheet with all 4 of the required elements.
---	--	--	---

Criterion Score: 4.00

B. Brief Summary

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not provide a summary of the actual development of the project.	The candidate provides an imprecise summary of the actual development of the project.	The candidate provides a reasonable summary of the actual development of the project.	The candidate provides a precise summary of the actual development of the project.

Criterion Score: 4.00

Comments on this criterion: The submission includes a detailed summary that define "the purpose of the application is to record insurance claims, primarily for maritime-related companies, along with details of Assets (vessels), Insurance Policies, etc" that provides the foundation for the development of the project.

B1. Description

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not provide a description of the project.	The candidate provides an imprecise description of the project.	The candidate provides a reasonable description of the project.	The candidate provides a precise description of the project.

Criterion Score: 4.00

Comments on this criterion: The essay includes a detailed description that define the the business case and technology used to facilitate the goals of the project.

B2. Other Work Done

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not provide an expanded review of the other work done in the area.	The candidate provides an inadequately expanded review of the other work done in the area.	Not applicable.	The candidate provides an adequately expanded review of other work done in the area.

Criterion Score: 4.00

Comments on this criterion: A comprehensive evaluation of other work and previous versions are included in the submission to support the project goals.

B3. Rationale and Systems Analysis

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not provide a rationale and systems analysis for the project deliverables.	The candidate provides an illogical rationale and systems analysis for the project deliverables.	The candidate provides a logical rationale and systems analysis for the project deliverables.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported rationale and systems analysis for the project deliverables.

Criterion Score: 4.00

C. Project Goals and Objectives

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate lists the goals and objectives of the project without an accompanying explanation of why or why not each was accomplished.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of why or why not some or all of the goals and objectives were accomplished.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of why or why not each of the goals and objectives were accomplished.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of why or why not each of the goals and objectives were accomplished.

Criterion Score: 4.00

Comments on this criterion: Understand the purpose of the application, Understand how the application is deployed, Understand the different technologies used, Understand System Parameterization and Configuration Management when delivering client databases, Understand the need to unit test, processes for testing and reporting abnormalities, Supplement testing scripts with additional test plans, Understand the process for creating SQL Server Scripts and executing scripts against test databases, Prepare deployment packages for companys clients, Providing technical support via email/telephone to assist clients, Providing Update Deployment packages, as defined as the project goal and objectives for the project.

D. Project Timeline

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain why or why not any of the timeframes were met.	The candidate provides an implausible explanation of why or why not any of the timeframes were met.	Not applicable.	The candidate provides a plausible explanation of why or why not all of the timeframes were met.

Criterion Score: 4.00

E. Project Development

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain what the project actually accomplished.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of what the project actually accomplished.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of what the project actually accomplished.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of what the project actually accomplished.

Criterion Score: 4.00

E1. Problems Encountered

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain the problems encountered and how they were solved.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of the problems encountered and how they were solved.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of the problems encountered and how they were solved.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of the problems encountered and how they were solved.

Criterion Score: 4.00

E2. Reasons for Changes

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain the reasons for changes made to the original plan.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of the reasons for changes made to the original plan.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of the reasons for changes made to the original plan.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of the reasons for changes made to the original plan.

Criterion Score: 3.00

E3. Unanticipated Requirements

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain any unanticipated requirements or components that needed to be resolved.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of any unanticipated requirements or components that needed to be resolved.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of any unanticipated requirements or components that needed to be resolved.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of any unanticipated requirements or components that needed to be resolved.

Criterion Score: 4.00

E4. Actual and Potential Effects

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain the actual and potential effects of the project.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of the actual and potential effects of the project.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of the actual and potential effects of the project.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of the actual and potential effects of the project.

Criterion Score: 4.00

E5. Conclusions

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain the conclusions about the success and effectiveness of the project.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of the conclusions about the success and effectiveness of the project.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of the conclusions about the success and effectiveness of the project.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of the conclusions about the success and effectiveness of the project.

Criterion Score: 4.00

F. Additional Deliverables

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not include any appropriate additional deliverables.	The candidate includes some additional deliverables, but they are not appropriate.	Not applicable.	The candidate includes appropriate additional deliverables.

Criterion Score: 4.00

G. Demonstrated Competencies

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate provides an incomplete Competency Matrix.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	The candidate provides a complete Competency Matrix.

Criterion Score: 4.00

Comments on this criterion: A completed competency matrix is included in the submission.

G1a. Leadership and Professionalism

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Leadership and Professionalism.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Leadership and Professionalism.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Leadership and Professionalism.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Leadership and Professionalism.

Criterion Score: 4.00

G1b. Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------

The candidate does not explain how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving.
---	---	--	--

Criterion Score: 4.00

G1c. Language and Communication

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Language and Communication.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Language and Communication.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Language and Communication.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Language and Communication.

Criterion Score: 4.00

G1d. Quantitative Literacy

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Quantitative Literacy.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Quantitative Literacy.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Quantitative Literacy.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated competency in Quantitative Literacy.

Criterion Score: 4.00

G2. Information Technology Competency

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate does not explain how the development of the project demonstrated technology competency in at least 1 of the areas.	The candidate provides an illogical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated technology competency in at least 1 of the areas.	The candidate provides a logical explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated technology competency in at least 1 of the areas.	The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of how the development of the project demonstrated technology competency in at least 1 of the areas.

Criterion Score: 4.00

H. APA Format

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary
The candidate's project has 5 or more minor errors and some major errors in APA formatting.	The candidate's project has 3-4 minor errors and no major errors in APA formatting.	The candidate's project has only 1-2 minor errors in APA formatting.	The candidate's project has no readily detectable errors in APA formatting.

Criterion Score: 4.00

Overall Holistic

(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary

Unacceptable	Needs Revision	Meets Standard	Exemplary
Criterion Score: 4.00			