

CS 200: Project Proposal Rubric

	Target (full credit)	Needs improvement (partial credit)	Unacceptable (no credit)
Title [2 pt]	The title clearly describes the project.	The title describes the project.	The title is missing or seems to have no connection to the project.
Formatting [2 pts]	The page is formatting correctly according to the provided template.	The page is mostly formatted correctly according to the provided template, with minor spacing/formatting errors.	The template is not used or there are major formatting discrepancies.
Language conventions [2 pts]	There are no spelling, grammatical, nor punctuation errors.	There are a few spelling, grammatical, or punctuational errors.	There are many spelling, grammatical, and/or punctuational errors. You are required to consult the Writing Center for future assignments.
Contribution [4 pts]	<p>All requirements and objectives are identified.</p> <p>The deliverable offered new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Likewise, the application is based on stated criteria, analysis, and constraints.</p> <p>The software outline clearly specifies the organization of the software and expected behavior/functionality. Additional stretch goals are identified if time permits.</p>	<p>All requirements are identified but some objectives are not specified or are unclear.</p> <p>The deliverable offered some new information or approach to the topic under discussion. The application is reasonable.</p> <p>The software outline specifies the organization of the software, but some expected behavior/functionality is unclear. Stretch goals are not identified.</p>	<p>Many requirements and objectives are not identified.</p> <p>The deliverable offered no new information or approach to the topic under discussion. Few application considerations are analyzed and other factors were ignored or incompletely analyzed.</p> <p>The software outline is missing or does not provide details concerning the purpose and behavior/functionality.</p>
Composition [4 pts]	The deliverable was well organized and clearly written. The underlying logic was clearly articulated and easy to follow. Words were chosen that precisely expressed the intended meaning and supported reader comprehension. Diagrams or analyses enhanced and clarified presentation of ideas. Sentences were grammatical and free from errors.	The deliverable was organized and clearly written for the most part. In some areas the logic and/or flow of ideas were difficult to follow. Words were well chosen with some minor expectations. Diagrams were consistent with the text. Sentences were mostly grammatical and/or only a few spelling errors were present, but they did not hinder the reader.	The deliverable lacked overall organization. The reader had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. Diagrams were absent or inconsistent with the text. Grammatical and spelling errors made it difficult for the reader to interpret the text in places. Uses long, rambling, or run-on sentences.
Subject Knowledge [4 pts]	<p>The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major and minor concepts into the response. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking about the topic.</p> <p>All relevant information was obtained and information sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were well supported by the information.</p>	<p>The deliverable demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major concepts into the response. The deliverable also demonstrated evidence of limited research effort and/or initial of thinking about the topic.</p> <p>Sufficient information was obtained and most sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were mostly supported by the information.</p>	<p>The deliverable did not demonstrate knowledge of the course content, evidence of the research effort or depth of thinking about the topic.</p> <p>Insufficient information was obtained and/or sources lack validity. Analysis and design considerations were not supported by the information collected.</p>
Citations [2 pts]	All sources are present and correctly cited.	Most sources are present and correctly cited.	Most sources are missing or incorrectly cited.

Future steps (circle all that apply):

- The proposal in its current state far from being an acceptable topic to pursue for your Junior IS. Rework the proposal with a TA and resubmit it for approval.
- Some specifics of your project are too vague, too broad, or too narrow. Additional work may include:
 - Re-work your software outline/prototype.
 - Determine the programming language to be used.
 - Determine any packages, frameworks, or libraries to be used.
 - Determine the exact input to your software.
 - Determine the exact output of your software.
 - Clarify the GUI of your software.
 - The software component is too small; add more features/functionality.
 - The software component is too large; reduce features and narrow the scope.
 - Add and/or clarify the “stretch” goals of your project which will occur if time permits.
 - Intermediate details on your proposed topic or software are missing. Please clarify.
 - Be more specific about what theory you will research and write about.
- There may be some issues regarding your citations/sources.
 - Do not use Wikipedia as a cited source. It may give you an idea of where to find primary sources, but it is not a primary source.
 - There are not enough reputable sources which are peer-reviewed, such as journal articles, conference papers, or textbooks.
 - In-line citations are incorrectly formatted. Refer to guidelines.
 - Some references are incorrectly formatted, such as incorrect capitalization, inconsistent details (e.g., some citations provide a month and year and others only specify a year), or missing details (e.g., year, author, title).
- Meet with the Writing Center before submitting future writing assignments.
- Meet with a TA to discuss the above steps.
- Meet with your professor to discuss the above steps.
- Other: