SCALE FOR PROJECT MOD1 (/PROJECTS/MOD1)

Introduction

Please respect the following rules:

- Remain polite, courteous, respectful and constructive throughout the correction process. The well-being of the community depends on it.

- Identify with the person (or the group) graded the eventual dysfunctions of the work. Take the time to discuss and debate the problems you have identified.

- You must consider that there might be some difference in how your peers might have understood the project's instructions and the scope of its functionalities. Always keep an open mind and grade him/her as honestly as possible. The pedagogy is valid only if the peer-evaluation is conducted seriously.

Guidelines

- Only grade the work that is in the student or group's GiT repository.

- Double-check that the GiT repository belongs to the student or the group. Ensure that the work is for the relevant project and also check that "git clone" is used in an empty folder.

- Check carefully that no malicious aliases was used to fool you and make you evaluate something other than the content of the official repository.

- To avoid any surprises, carefully check that both the correcting and the corrected students have reviewed the possible scripts used to facilitate the grading.

- If the correcting student has not completed that particular

project yet, it is mandatory for this student to read the
entire subject prior to starting the defence.

- Use the flags available on this scale to signal an empty repository,
non-functioning program, a norm error, cheating etc. In these cases,
the grading is over and the final grade is 0 (or -42 in case of
cheating). However, with the exception of cheating, you are
encouraged to continue to discuss your work (even if you have not
finished it) in order to identify any issues that may have caused
this failure and avoid repeating the same mistake in the future.

Attachments

Subject (https://cdn.intra.42.fr/pdf/pdf/4755/mod1.en.pdf)

resources (/uploads/document/document/59/resources.tgz)

Preliminaries

The mod1 project leaves a lot of freedom to groups that work on it. Proceed with the grading accordingly.

Basic stuff

If at least one of the following points fails, the defense stops.

- The whole group is present.
- There is something in the git repository.
- There is an author file.
- No cheating.

Yes No

The ground

Is there something happening?

Run the program, with a .mod1 file if necessary as argument.
Is there a result? Something displayed? It looks like a
delimited surface as requested in the subject?

Yes No

More precisely ...

Check that the subject is respected.

- Edges have a nil altitude.
- Surface is smooth, round everywhere without edges.
- The surface matches the information of the .mod1 used.
- Test with other .mod1 files, modify some of the files (move a point, change its altitude, etc...) and check that the render is still consistant.
- Ask about the limits used, approach from the edges points to see if they still exist and are well used.

☑ Yes ☒ No

The water

Static (or not)

With or without animation for now, there is one way or another water on the surface, covering the lower parts and leave the heigher parts visible.

☑ Yes ☒ No

Scenario 1 - uniform rising

The level of water rises evenly everywhere from the edges. If there is a crater water can't fill it before it reaches the lowest edge of it. The animation must be accurate.

☑ Yes ☒ No

Scenario 2 - The wave

A wave arrives from a side and invades the surface little by little. The animation is accurate. Let's avoid "waterfalls" that flows slowly. The filling of the furthest surface area from the wave is logical and consistant with the topography.

☑ Yes ☒ No

Scenario 3 - The rain

It rains on the surface. Every hollow area is filled first. It's even better if water seems to be running along the walls. If not the group must convince the corrector that the water goes on the whole surface and how the water that goes along a slope make the puddle bigger.

☑ Yes ☒ No

The project's group

How did the implementation of the projet happen?

The group must describe the work organisation. A lot of scenarios are possible stay open-minded. Don't validate this section if you have the feeling the group is messy in its organisation, or shows a lack of proper time management. This section is purely subjective and count as such. But know that the subjective judgement of a hierarchy will be part of your professional future, and even if you don't understand it know, you can act on it.

☑ Yes ☒ No

Bonus

We love bonuses.

There is a lot of possible bonuses. A very cool 3D interface or that propose a lot of different scenarios (empty a bathtub for example). Textures on the surface. Music or sounds to make it realistic or people that run and scream watching the water rise. The St Michal's mount rising tide...rating: multi

Rate it from 0 (failed) through 5 (excellent)

Ratings

Don't forget to check the flag corresponding to the defense

✔ Ok

★ Outstanding project

Empty work

Incomplete work

No author file

Invalid compilation

Norme

Cheat

Crash

Forbidden function

Conclusion

Leave a comment on this evaluation

Preview!!!