

Evaluation Results

[Click Here to Provide Feedback About This Assessment](#)

<p>Author: Bernard Nsabimana</p> <p>Date Evaluated: 10/10/2013 08:31:39 AM (MST)</p> <p>DRF template: TWA1 - IT: Technical Writing (V4 UNDERGRAD-0407)</p> <p>Program: TWA1 - IT: Technical Writing (V4 UNDERGRAD-0407)-PA</p> <p>Evaluation Method: Using Rubric</p>
--

Evaluation Summary for Technical Writing/Proposal: Proposal (2007)

Final Score:	3.50 (out of 4)
Overall comments:	This is a competent and well developed discussion of working with TecnoRisk to conduct software testing and quality assurance to ensure the functionality of a new software release. Good job!

Detailed Results (Rubric used: TWA1 - IT: Technical Writing)

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: 3.00			
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: 3.00			
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: 3.00			
A. Cover Sheet			
(1) Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary

The candidate does not provide a coversheet with any of the required elements.	The candidate provides a coversheet with only 1-4 of the required elements.	Not applicable.	The candidate provides a coversheet with all 5 of the required elements.
Criterion Score: 4.00			
B1. Summary			
(1) Unacceptable The candidate does not provide a summary of the project.	(2) Needs Revision The candidate provides an imprecise summary of the project.	(3) Meets Standard The candidate provides a reasonable summary of the project.	(4) Exemplary The candidate provides a precise summary of the project.
Criterion Score: 3.00			
Comments on this criterion: The submission provides a sound summary of the project.			
B2. Review of Other Work			
(1) Unacceptable The candidate does not provide a review of the other work done in the area.	(2) Needs Revision The candidate provides an imprecise review of the other work done in the area.	(3) Meets Standard The candidate provides a reasonable review of the other work done in the area.	(4) Exemplary The candidate provides a precise review of other work done in the area.
Criterion Score: 3.00			
B3. Rationale and Systems Analysis			
(1) Unacceptable The candidate does not provide a rationale and systems analysis for the project deliverables.	(2) Needs Revision The candidate provides an illogical rationale and systems analysis for the project deliverables.	(3) Meets Standard The candidate provides a logical rationale and systems analysis for the project deliverables.	(4) Exemplary The candidate provides a credible and well-supported rationale and systems analysis for the project deliverables.
Criterion Score: 4.00			
Comments on this criterion: A logical and detailed rationale and analysis for the project deliverables has been provided.			
C. Project Goals and Objectives			
(1) Unacceptable The candidate does not provide a list of goals and objectives of the project.	(2) Needs Revision The candidate provides an imprecise list of goals and objectives of the project.	(3) Meets Standard Not applicable.	(4) Exemplary The candidate provides a precise list of goals and objectives of the project.
Criterion Score: 4.00			
D. Project Deliverables			
(1) Unacceptable The candidate does not explain what type of deliverables the project will provide.	(2) Needs Revision The candidate provides an illogical explanation of what type of deliverables the project will provide.	(3) Meets Standard The candidate provides a logical explanation of what type of deliverables the project will provide.	(4) Exemplary The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of what type of deliverables the project will provide.
Criterion Score: 4.00			
Comments on this criterion: A clear and detailed explanation of the project deliverables has been provided.			
E. Project Timeline and Milestones			

(1) Unacceptable The candidate does not provide a projected timeline for the project with milestones.	(2) Needs Revision Not applicable.	(3) Meets Standard Not applicable.	(4) Exemplary The candidate provides a projected timeline for the project with milestones.
---	--	--	--

Criterion Score: 4.00

F. Demonstrated Competencies

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

Criterion Score: 4.00

F1a. Leadership and Professionalism

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

Criterion Score: 4.00

F1b. Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving

(1) Unacceptable The candidate does not explain how the project will demonstrate competency in Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving.	(2) Needs Revision The candidate provides an illogical explanation of how the project will demonstrate competency in Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving.	(3) Meets Standard The candidate provides a logical explanation of how the project will demonstrate competency in Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving.	(4) Exemplary The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of how the project will demonstrate competency in Upper Division Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving.
---	---	--	---

Criterion Score: 3.00

F1c. Language and Communication

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

Criterion Score: 4.00

F1d. Quantitative Literacy

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

Quantitative Literacy.	competency in Quantitative Literacy.	competency in Quantitative Literacy.	will demonstrate competency in Quantitative Literacy.
Criterion Score: 3.00			
F2. Information Technology Competency			
(1) Unacceptable The candidate does not explain how the project will demonstrate technology competency in at least 1 of the areas.	(2) Needs Revision The candidate provides an illogical explanation of how the project will demonstrate technology in at least 1 of the areas.	(3) Meets Standard The candidate provides a logical explanation of how the project will demonstrate technology in at least 1 of the areas.	(4) Exemplary The candidate provides a credible and well-supported explanation of how the project will demonstrate technology in at least 1 of the areas.
Criterion Score: 4.00			
G1. APA Format			
(1) Unacceptable The candidate's proposal has 5 or more minor errors and some major errors in APA formatting.	(2) Needs Revision The candidate's proposal has 3-4 minor errors and no major errors in APA formatting.	(3) Meets Standard The candidate's proposal has only 1-2 minor errors in APA formatting.	(4) Exemplary The candidate's proposal has no readily detectable errors in APA formatting.
Criterion Score: 3.00			
Overall Holistic			
(1) Unacceptable Unacceptable	(2) Needs Revision Needs Revision	(3) Meets Standard Meets Standard	(4) Exemplary Exemplary
Criterion Score: 3.00			