Grading criteria for the final projects

Each project is graded according to the following criteria:

| Overall Product (70%+10%) | | Functional qualities (40%) | Required Functions | All required functions are implemented and demoed w/o bugs | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Additional Functions (10%) | Extra Credit | Implemented features that improves the usability and /or safety of the software (only given when all required functions implemented) | | |
| | | Non- functional qualities (15%) | Object-oriented | The code is reasonably and | | |
| | | | programming (2%) | appropriately structured with OOP | | |
| | | | Readability of the | Proper naming convention and code | | |
| | | | code (1%) | commenting | | |
| | | | Overall Traceability (7%) | Code structure is the same as the | | |
| | | | | class diagram (4%) All required documents are provided | | |
| | | | | with reasonable effort (3%) | | |
| | | | Presentation | Demonstration of system functions | | |
| | | | (5%) | clearly within a short period of time | | |
| | | Validation (15%) | Testing (8%) | System has been tested with reasonable coverage at various levels | | |
| | | | Model checking (7%) | System checked for safety requirements with reasonable assumptions on the environment | | |
| | Requirement (10%) | Requirement document (4%) | Completeness (2%) | Should cover all required and implemented system features | | |
| | | | Traceability | Structure and naming should be | | |
| | | | (2%) | consistent | | |
| | | _ | Completeness | The user can get proper instructions | | |
| | | User manual (3%) | (2%) | on how to operate the system | | |
| | | | Comprehensiveness (1%) | The document is well organized and easily referenced | | |
| Documentation (30%) | | Weekly Meeting | Completeness (1%) | All reports submitted on time | | |
| | | Reports (3%) | Reasonable (2%) | Should contain comprehensive info on progresses of the project | | |
| | Development (10%) | Customer Consultations (2%) | Progresses are made gradually | Previously identified problems are fixed in the next iteration | | |
| | | Specification (8%) | Completeness (3%) | Another developer can implement your system w/o ambiguities | | |
| | | | Traceability (5%) | Consistent with the requirement and code | | |
| | Validation (10%) | Validation Report (10%) | Testing (6%) | The testing procedure and results are well documented | | |
| | | | Model Checking (4%) | The models of the system and the environment are explained, and the properties are justified. | | |

The score of each student is calculated as the average of the overall product scores of the three projects plus the scores for each documentation duty assigned in the initial job allocation. The score is then multiplied by the project's percentage in the final score.

Example:

| Project 1 | | | Project 2 | | | Project 3 | | |
|-------------------|-------------|----|-------------------|-------------|----|-------------------|-------------|----|
| Overall Product | | 55 | Overall Product | | 60 | Overall Product | | 65 |
| Document ation | Requirement | 8 | Docume ntation | Requirement | 5 | Docume ntation | Requirement | 6 |
| | Development | 7 | | Development | 4 | | Development | 3 |
| | Validation | 5 | | Validation | 9 | | Validation | 7 |

The score for each student is calculated as follow:

| | Score |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Student 1 (1R2D3V) | (55+60+65)/3+8+4+7=79% |
| Student 2 (2R3D1V) | (55+60+65)/3+5+3+5=73% |
| Student 3 (3R1D2V) | (55+60+65)/3+6+7+9=82% |