32Writing Assignment / Grading Rubric 1 *(Graded by Dr. Almstrum)*
CS373, Software Engineering, Spring 2005
Rubric 1: Format, Overall

09am section
Student: **STUDENTX** */ EID: studentx*

	Throughout the grading rubrics, 5 is the best rating and 1 is the poorest rating.	

I. Submission accomplished correctly *(email, electronic document, hard copy)*	**Rating for part I:**	**4**

Number of hard copies turned in (3 required): 3 [Hardcopy submitted late] *Recorded time of submission to Blackboard (due 03-04-05 08:00):* 03-05-2005 09:56 [More than 24 hours after the deadline due to doing "add" rather than "send" when doing the upload.] *Label on Blackboard posting:* Correct *Name of submitted file:* Good *Your comment at the Blackboard dropbox: None* *Dr. Almstrum's overall comment on submission issues:* Nice job of following the submission guidelines except for getting the hardcopy in late and making the wrong choice in doing the dropbox submission.	5 all aspects of submission correct 4 3 some problems with submission 2 1 submission accomplished incorrectly

II. Formatting: *running header on hard copy*	**Rating for part II:**	**4.5**

Comments on running header: Fine *Comments on <title> tag:* Using the file name as the title tag is a poor choice. The title tag should be used to give a brief, meaningful description of the document.	5 running header is correct in all respects 4 3 present but lacks key information 2 1 no running header

III. Formatting: *opening banner*	**Rating for part III:**	**5**

Comments on opening banner: Fine (although the intention was to remove the asterisks from the placeholder name location rather than leaving it after you had filled in your own name).	5 good opening banner in all respects 4 3 some parts problematic 2 1 no opening banner

IV. HTML source code: *clean source file, good use of html tags*	Rating for part IV:	2

Output from tidy: 28 warnings and 6 errors *Output from W3C HTML Validator [http://validator.w3.org/]:* ■ *Detected document type:* Not addressed due to other problems ■ *Detected character Encoding:* None found; fell back to UTF-8 ■ *Number of errors reported:* Unable to validate this document because on lines it contained one or more bytes that the validator could not interpret (listed 133, 184, 186, 194-195, 200, 202, 204, 207, 216, 220-221, 227, 236, 269, 272, 286, 290, 296, 298-299, 322, 359, 361, 367, 388-391, 417, 438, 453, 464, 491, 502, 515, 524, 526, 537, 583, 586-587, 589, 593, 609, 614, 616, 619, 621, 629, 631, 633-634, 653, 658, 663) ■ *Was it valid?* No validation was attempted due to fatal errors *Readability of the HTML source:* Readability and structure of underlying HTML is quite good. *Use of HTML mechanisms:* Many problems in choices of mechanisms. Did not always use heading tags to create headings. It is confusing to see 5-deep <div> tags surrounding the <hr> tags. What is the point of this? There are many empty tag pairs and a few stray ending tags. The list in section 4.4 was defined by hand rather than using list tags; as you defined it, the bullet character displayed as a left parenthesis rather than as a character that was clearly serving the role of a bullet.	5 good in all respects 4 3 generally good, some problems 2 1 very poor HTML source file

V. Layout of document: *good use of real estate, good font size, etc.*	Rating for part V:	5

Comments on overall layout of document: Overall layout is good.	5 good layout in all respects 4 3 some aspects of layout disturb readability 2 1 very poor layout

VI. Section 1.0: Overview	Rating for part VI:	5

Comments on Section 1.0: Fine *Comments on collaboration statement:* Fine	5 good opening section 4 3 somewhat deficient 2 1 poor

VII. Section 4.0: Lessons and Advice	**Rating for part VII:**	**4**
5 good … 4 … 3 somewhat lacking … 2 … 1 discussion of lessons and advice is poor		

	5 good 4 3 lessons or advice somewhat lacking 2 1 discussion of lessons and advice is poor
Comments on Section 4.1 (Documentation): The points you make are interesting, but they do not get directly to the point as your writing tends to wander a bit. You included one inaccuracy in this section, in stating the reason for the changes in the S2S directory structure description in 2001. *Comments on Section 4.2 (V&V):* Your discussion of V&V approaches focuses solely on the testing aspects; you do not acknowledge the many other important activities that belong to V&V. Your comparison of the testing approaches brings out important points. *Comments on Section 4.3 (Lessons):* Good lessons. I liked the way you connected the lessons to what you might be able to do this semester, although there was more emphasis on your project than I would prefer for these reviews. *Comments on Section 4.4 (Advice):* Nice lessons, although I thought that you should have made the second lesson, about the absence of planned features, more specific so other readers would better understand what you meant.	

VIII. Sections 1&4 Writing Mechanics: Style, tone, clarity	**Rating for part VIII:**	**4**
5 = good style, tone, clarity; 3 = mediocre style, tone, clarity; 1 = very poor style, tone, clarity		
IX. Sections 1&4 Writing Mechanics: Grammar	**Rating for part IX:**	**4**
5 = good; few if any errors; 3 = some problems, not distracting; 1 = distracting # of errors		
X. Sections 1&4 Writing Mechanics: Word choice	**Rating for part X:**	**4**
5 = choice of words precise; 3 = sometimes inaccurate or poor; 1 = frequently wrong for context		
XI. Sections 1&4 Writing Mechanics: Form issues (capitals, punctuation)	**Rating for part XI:**	**3.5**
5 = good; few if any errors; 3 = some problems, not distracting; 1 = distracting # of errors		
XII. Sections 1&4 Writing Mechanics: Spelling	**Rating for part XII:**	**5**
5 = no spelling errors; 3 = few spelling errors; 1 = distracting number of errors		

Comments on section 1 writing: Fine
Comments on section 4 writing: While the overall organization is fairly good, your writing tends to wander, a bit of "flow of consciousness", which keeps the reader from understanding your point as quickly as they should.
General comments on writing in sections 1 & 4: You have a solid basis for writing well. However, there is room for improvement in making your narrative clearer to help the reader understand your meaning directly. It would be worthwhile to enlist the aid of the UWC to help you improve your writing -- this is a skill that will be important as you enter the world of work. You make extensive use of contractions, which should be avoided in formal writing such as this. You had difficulties with word choices in many instances. Some phrasing was difficult to understand.

XIII. Formatting Sections 1&4	**Rating for part XIII:**	**5**
Comments on formatting of section 1.0: Fine *Comments on formatting of section 4.0:* Fine		

Overall Grade: 89.4%	content: 91.7% * 50% of Overall Grade = 45.8%	format/instructions: 88.8% * 20% of Overall Grade = 17.8%	writing: 86.0% * 30% of Overall Grade = 25.8%

The review summary pages are at the URL http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/s2s/reviews/sp05/. On the lessons page and the pages for projectA and projectB, your reviews appear under the code number 99