

Refactoring Presentation Evaluation Rubric

This is the rubric that will be used for evaluating your refactoring presentation.

Dimension	Exceptional Performance 4	Competent Performance 3	Acceptable Performance 2	Developing Performance 1	Beginning Performance 0
Design Knowledge (20%)	Team demonstrates full knowledge with explanations and elaboration.	Team is at ease with design, but fails to elaborate or discuss some design areas.	Some members of the team unable to answer some questions about the design, not at ease with it	Team is uncomfortable with information and can only answer basic design questions.	Team does not have grasp of information; team cannot answer questions about the design.
Refactoring (20%)	Team describes refactoring and fully justifies it with discussion of design principles and metrics.	Team describes the refactoring and provides justification including motivation provided by metrics.	Team describes the refactoring and provides rudimentary justification.	Team describes the refactoring without any justification.	Refactoring is not discussed during the presentation.
Use of Patterns (20%)	Team fully describes patterns in the refactored design discussing tradeoffs and consequences.	Team clearly identifies patterns used, the participants, and the rationale.	Team identifies patterns used but is uncomfortable justifying their use.	Some patterns misnamed, misunderstood, or not completely defined.	Team fails to identify patterns, confuses pattern intents and purposes, or did not use design patterns.
Organization (15%)	Information presented in a logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow. All areas covered with slides fully supporting speakers.	Information presented in logical sequence which audience can follow. All areas are covered.	Some of the information seems out of sequence or disconnected. Some information is missing from presentation.	Audience has difficulty following presentation because it jumps around or is missing major elements.	The organization is so poor that the audience cannot understand the presentation.
Delivery (15%)	Delivery made the presentation interesting and easy to follow.	Delivery was adequate. No problems noticed.	Delivery was uninteresting. Presenters just read off the slides.	Delivery problems: inadequate volume, errors pronouncing terms.	Delivery was completely incoherent, audience could not follow speakers.
Mechanics (10%)	Presentation layout and mechanics made it pleasant and attractive. Needed no other slides.	Presentation had adequate attention to mechanics and details, but missed some slide information.	Presentation had a few visual problems on slides, misspellings, or grammatical errors.	Presentation had many visual problems on slides, misspellings, or grammatical errors.	The mechanics of the presentation were so flawed that it was nearly incomprehensible