

EE486 Schedule Documentation / Client Contract

RUBRIC

General Information

- Grading:** Team (final) AND individual level (draft).
 The individual draft will be graded on a scale (to your benefit) such that an average assessment on the draft following this rubric may result in a higher score than had the submission been the final. It is expected that once your group submits a final, the product of those efforts will exceed those of each individual draft. You will receive feedback from your instructor or your GTA mentor by the Monday that follows submission of the draft.

Team = (Format + Intro. + Chart + Desc. + Comm. + Contract) =

Individual = (Format + Intro. + Chart + Desc. + Comm. + Contract) \times 1.5 =

Format:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 4)	Average (5 - 8)	Exceptional (9 - 12.5)
Explanation:	Not in memo format, and/or very poor grammar/spelling.	In memo format, but poor grammar/spelling.	In memo format and very good grammar/spelling.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

Introduction Paragraph:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 4)	Average (5 - 8)	Exceptional (9 - 12.5)
Explanation:	The memo makes no mention of what the project is and who is on the team.	The memo identifies the project (by title only), but not the team.	The memo identifies the project and the team, with a short description of the project.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

Gantt Chart(s):

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 6)	Average (7 - 12)	Exceptional (13 - 20)
Explanation:	Does not provide an overview schedule, or has no clear identification of the parts of the project that are needed to be done to bring the project to completion.	An overview is provided, with no or some idea of the subsystems (parts).	The overview provides a clear picture of the high level aspects and the subsystems that need to be completed, with clear high level milestones.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

Gantt Chart Discussion:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 6)	Average (7 - 12)	Exceptional (13 - 20)
Explanation:	Does not discuss critical path, float, or dependencies. No contingency plan is mentioned with relation to the critical path(s).	Mentions, but doesn't really discuss, critical path, float, or dependencies or contingency plans for critical path(s).	Clearly discusses critical path, float, and dependencies, with contingency plans identified for each part of the critical path(s).
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

Communication Strategy:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 6)	Average (7 - 12)	Exceptional (13 - 20)
Explanation:	No communication strategy is include and there is no evidence that the team has tried to negotiate a regular mentor meeting time.	A weekly mentor meeting might be identified, but there is no obvious thought on how/when/why the team will meet outside of this time slot.	The team has identified when to meet (weekly) with the team mentor, and how/when/why they will meet outside of this time. This includes communication methods and expectations for all team members (not per member though).
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

Client Contract:

Graded As:	Poor (0 - 6)	Average (7 - 12)	Exceptional (13 - 20)
Explanation:	No requirements are outlined, or those that are, are very fuzzy. This isn't something that your peers could say they could use to evaluate success of the project at the end of the year.	There are a number of requirements included, but exactly what they are (specifications) are missing. This might be something like "enable motor control" vs a more specific "enable motor control in the forward, reverse, and brake states via I2C serial communication."	The requirements are clear and specify the project to a high level of detail such that anyone could look at them and understand them without any serious questions. The client certainly won't have any questions at this level.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			