Project Evaluation Form

COS-301 (Software Engineering)
Dept of Computer Science, University of Pretoria

20 October 2014

(No of questions: 9, No of points: 90)

---

1 Instructions

- Please indicate absent team members by a "X" alongside the name.
- Feel free to briefly comment (positively or negatively) on individual team members.
- For each of the ten assessment criteria below, please use the space provided to suggest a team mark (out of 10, as indicated). You may, if you wish, also provide brief comments.
- If an assessment criterion is not relevant or has not been addressed in the project for whatever reason, simply assign 0 to it.
- The team mark awarded by you will be taken as the sum of the best seven marks out of the first nine assessment criteria.
- In the table at the end you may indicate recommendations for teams to be included in a sort-list for one of the prizes.

Team **Runtime**					
Name1		Name2		Name 3	

Criterion 1: Requirements management ..... (10 points)
Indicate the extent to which you think the team has managed to capture and manage the system requirements (both functional and non-functional). Have the requirements been captured in service or component contracts with pre- and post-conditions? Have the non-functional requirements been quantified? Are all requirements testable?

Mark: **Comments:**

Criterion 2: Architecture design ..... (10 points)
Has the team designed, documented and implemented an appropriate software architecture which is able to address non-functional requirements like scalability, performance, reliability, security, modifiability, integrability, ...? Is the team able to explain how the architectural concerns are

addressed within the architecture? Can the team explain the choices of architectural patterns, tactics/strategies and reference architectures?

Mark: **Comments:**

Criterion 3: Design of functionality ..... (10 points)
Are their solid design models for both, data structures and processes? Have the designs been captured in UML and has UML been used correctly? Can design elements be traced back to the requirements and vice versa?

Mark: **Comments:**

Criterion 4: Algorithmic innovation ..... (10 points)
To what extent has the team developed interesting and novel algorithms? Have the team identified algorithmic challenges and have they been able to effectively address them? Have they compared their algorithmic solution to alternatives? Can the team demonstrate that the algorithms are correct?

Mark: **Comments:**

Criterion 5: Quality assurance ..... (10 points)
Has the team been using unit testing, integration testing as well as testing against non-functional requirements (e.g. scalability, performance, reliability, ...)? Have pre- and post-conditions been specified for services? Has an appropriate method been followed to generate test data which can be used to effectively test the algorithms? Has the team been able to prove the correctness of their algorithms? Can they demonstrate test coverage?

Mark: **Comments:**

Criterion 6: Usability Engineering / HCI ..... (10 points)
Has the team shown diligence in providing user interfaces that are easy to learn and to use? Are the user interfaces visually appealing and appropriate for the software system? Does the UI design follow UI design standards? Has the team done usability testing and has it effectively caoptured the usability testing results and addressed any issues identified during usability testing?

Mark: **Comments:**

Criterion 7: Open-source software and software reuse ..... (10 points)
Has the team been able to sensibly leverage off existing software (open source, previous projects,

or proprietary)? Has the team contributed towards open source software, or is it likely to do so in the near future?

Mark: **Comments:**

Criterion 8: Overall software engineering excellence.....(10 points)

What is your overall sense of the team's technical and professional excellence as software engineers? Factor in issues such as the diligence on following a software process, effective configuration and build management, the quality of the code including adherence to coding standards and decoupling via interfaces and contracts, the quality of the documentation, ethical behaviour, effective client management, etc.

Mark: **Comments:**

Criterion 9: Professionalism.....(10 points)

What are your general impressions of the team's professionalism in terms of presentations, displays, notice boards, general demeanor, enthusiasm, etc.

Mark: **Comments:**

Recommendation for Prize Short-Listing

Please add a tick next to the prize if you feel the team should be included in the short-list for that prize:

The *Grintek Ewation* Prize for **Overall Software Engineering Excellence**	
The *EPI-USE Labs* Prize for **Innovation**	
The *Entelect* Prize for **Architectural Awareness**	
The *BBD* Prize for **Algorithmic Innovation**	
The *Kazazoom* Prize for the **Best Mobile Application**	
The *Standard Bank* Prize for **Usability Engineering/HCI**	
The *BBD* Prize for the **Integrability**	
The *CSIR & MWR InfoSecurity* Prize for the **Security**	
The *DVT* Prize for the **Code and Unit Testing Quality**	

Signature of examiner(s):