

Software Product Design and Development I

Senior Design Portfolio III

Group X -

- Delivery: ☒ On-time ☐ Late: X days
- The report follows the presented format: ☒ Yes ☐ 0 points No, ☐ 1 point, Yes, but could be improved
- **UML Design Rubric (5 Points Total)**
 - ☐ 0 Points (**No Design Diagram**): No design diagram is presented or linked in the PR.
 - ☐ 1 Point (**Minimal Design**): A design diagram is presented, but it's incomplete, unclear, or lacks relevance to the feature/use case. Minimal effort shown.
 - ☐ 2 Points (**Basic Design**): A design diagram is provided but may lack some key elements or clarity. It covers the basics but doesn't fully capture the interaction between components.
 - ☐ 3 Points (**Moderate Design**): The design diagram is mostly complete and represents the interactions between components clearly. Shows a good understanding of the feature/use case but may be missing minor details.
 - ☐ 4 Points (**Strong Design**): The design diagram is clear, detailed, and follows the guidelines well. It effectively captures the interactions between components and shows a solid understanding of the system.
 - ☐ 5 Points (**Exemplary Design**): The design diagram is highly detailed, well-organized, and clearly linked in the PR. It provides a thorough representation of the system's interactions and reflects an excellent understanding of the feature/use case.
- Prototype Update:
 - Prototype screenshots:
 - ☐ 2 points Yes, ☐ 0 points No, ☐ 1 point, Yes, but not sufficient
 - **CI pipeline:**
 - ☐ 0 Points (**No Implementation**): No CI pipeline has been implemented.
 - ☐ 1 Point (**Minimal Implementation**): A basic CI pipeline is in place but lacks several critical steps. Essential configurations may be missing or incorrectly set up.
 - ☐ 2 Points: (**Moderate Implementation**): Implements all necessary steps required for the project. The pipeline is functional but lacks optimization or advanced features.
 - ☐ 3 Points: (**Strong Implementation**): Includes comprehensive condition checks and branching strategies. Demonstrates a strong understanding and application of CI principles in the context of the project.
 - ☐ 4 Points: (**Advanced Implementation**): There is extensive integration with third-party tools for quality checks, security analysis, monitoring e.g. Codecov, Sonarqube, etc
 - ☐ 5 Points: (**Exemplary Implementation**): The CI pipeline is optimized for performance, using caching, and dependency management to speed up build and

test times. It includes advanced features like artifact management, deployment pipelines, and robust failure handling.

o Pull Requests Management Assessment Criteria

- ☐ 0 Points: No adherence to guidelines; missing contribution guidelines, PR templates, and issue linkage.
- ☐ 1 Point (**Minimal Compliance**): Minimal guideline acknowledgment with basic PR template use and weak issue linkage.
- ☐ 2 Points (**Basic Compliance**): Basic adherence with evidence of PR template use and some effort in linking PRs to issues.
- ☐ 3 Points (**Moderate Compliance**): Good use of PR templates, consistent issue linkage, and occasional use of diagrams. Regular draft PRs for feedback.
- ☐ 4 Points (**Strong Compliance**): Strong guideline implementation, including structured PR descriptions, consistent issue linkage, and effective draft PR use.
- ☐ 5 Points (**Exemplary Compliance**): Comprehensive and exceptional PR management with full guideline adherence, extensive markdown and diagram use, and outstanding collaboration via draft PRs.

o Team Pull Request Reviews Compliance:

- ☐ 0 Points: No guideline adherence; absent feedback, assignments, and automation.
- ☐ 1 Point (**Minimal Compliance**): Minimal guideline acknowledgment; sparse feedback and assignments.
- ☐ 2 Points (**Basic Compliance**): Basic guideline use with general feedback; some assignment organization and minimal automation.
- ☐ 3 Points (**Moderate Compliance**): Good guideline practices; actionable feedback and clear assignments; some automation documented.
- ☐ 4 Points (**Strong Compliance**): Strong guideline adherence; high-quality feedback; effective assignments; good automation use.
- ☐ 5 Points (**Exemplary Compliance**): Exceptional guideline implementation; comprehensive feedback; thoroughly conducted reviews; extensive automation; evident code sharing value.

o Test coverage percentage:

- 5 ☐ ≥ 90 , ☐ 4 ≥ 80 , ☐ 3 ≥ 70 , ☐ 2 ≥ 60 , ☐ 1 ≥ 50 , ☐ 0 ≤ 50

o Issue Triaging Compliance:

- ☐ 0 Points: No template; unstructured issues.
- ☐ 1 Point: Basic template exists but is rarely followed; vague issues.
- ☐ 2 Points: Template used inconsistently; issues lack key details like reproduction steps or code links.
- ☐ 3 Points: Template used regularly; issues include reasonable details and some effort to confirm problems.
- ☐ 4 Points: Template consistently used; issues have clear descriptions, links, and confirmed problems.
- ☐ 5 Points: Template fully utilized; issues are detailed, reproducible, and well-documented for efficient triaging.

- Team Reporting Update:
 - Team tasks chart:
 - ☐ 2 points Yes, ☐ 0 points No, ☐ 1 point, Yes, but needs improvement
 - Team contribution chart:
 - ☐ Yes, ☐ 0 points No, ☐ 1 point, Yes, but needs improvement
 - Success Report: Plan (& Estimates)
 - ☐ 2 points Yes, ☐ 0 points No, ☐ 1 point, Yes, but needs improvement
- Challenges and Factors:
 - ☐ 0 Points: No action on identified challenges or factors.
 - ☐ 1 Point (**Minimal Compliance**): Minimal strategy details; scarce implementation evidence.
 - ☐ 2 Points (**Basic Compliance**): Outlined plans with some initial implementation efforts.
 - ☐ 3 Points (**Moderate Compliance**): Documented detailed plans; moderate implementation with room for improvement.
 - ☐ 4 Points (**Significant Compliance**) Description: Comprehensive planning with clear and effective implementation; most challenges and factors are adequately addressed.
 - ☐ 5 Points (**Strong Compliance**) Description: Detailed planning with clear implementation focus; significant and impactful progress is noted, showcasing effective problem-solving and adaptation to influencing factors.
- Conclusion - Reflection on the entire project is well resented
 - ☐ 2 points, Yes, ☐ 0 points, No, ☐ 1 point, Yes, but could be improved
- Meeting notes:
 - ☐ 0 Points: No minutes provided or complete disregard for the template, with no evidence of physical meetings.
 - ☐ 1 Point: Poorly organized minutes, hard to follow, lacking key details, and less than 25% physical meetings.
 - ☐ 2 Points: Basic alignment with the template but missing depth, with 25%-49% physical meetings.
 - ☐ 3 Points: Good template adherence, key points documented but could be clearer, and exactly 50% balance between online and physical meetings.
 - ☐ 4 Points: Well-organized and clear minutes that effectively document meeting dynamics, with more than 50% of physical meetings showing a preference for face-to-face interaction.
 - ☐ 5 Points: Exceptionally detailed and clear minutes that perfectly follow the template, with a strong mix of online and physical meetings demonstrating optimal engagement and productivity.
- Team Discussion on Discord (General Activity and Collaboration):
 - ☐ 0 Points: No activity or communication on Discord.
 - ☐ 1 Point: Minimal communication; sporadic and disorganized updates or discussions.
 - ☐ 2 Points: Basic communication with occasional updates, but limited team collaboration or engagement.

- o **[] 3 Points:** Regular and clear discussions, including task updates, pull request/issue announcements, and some problem-solving.
- o **[] 4 Points:** Consistent, organized communication with active collaboration on tasks, pull requests, issues, and design clarifications.
- o **[] 5 Points:** Highly active and collaborative communication, demonstrating frequent updates, effective problem-solving, and strong team engagement.

General Feedback