Team Project Assessment CV/DIP course
Title of Project

Chilcoat, Clark, Heath

August 2020

Table 1: Project Assessment by Team

Quality	Evaluated to be	pts awarded
Conformance to Specification (40pts)	Good	
Data structures and algorithm (20pts)	Good	
Testing (20pts)	Good	
Coding (10pts)	Good	
Readability (5pts)	Good	
Documentation (5pts)	Good	
Total		

Comments: For the self evaluation. All of the given specification are met, the data structures are not inefficient, and we tested various different cases as we were working on the program and after we finished. The code is readable and documented.

	Good	Fair	Poor
Conformance to Specifications (40 points)	The program works correctly and meets all of the specifications. (40 points).	The program works correctly but implements less than 50% of the specifications. (30 points)	The program produces incorrect results or does not compile. (10 points)
Data Structures and Algorithms (20 points)	Appropriate and efficient data structures and algorithms are used. (20 points)	The data structures and algorithms used get the job done but they are neither a natural fit nor efficient. (10 points)	Solution is based on brute force approach. No consideration is given to selection of suitable data structures and algorithms. (5 points)
Testing (20 points)	Coverage of test cases is comprehensive. Following information is provided for test cases: inputs, expected results, pass/fail, and remarks.(20 points)	Coverage of test cases is low. Test case documentation is incomplete. (10 points)	Cursory treatment of testing. No documentation of test cases. (5 points)
Coding (10 points)	The code is compact without sacrificing readability and understandability. (10 points)	The code is fairly compact without sacrificing readability and understandability. (5 points)	The code is brute force and unnecessarily long. (2 points)
Readability (5 points)	The code is well organized and very easy to follow. (5 points)	The code is readable only by someone who knows what it is supposed to be doing. (3 points)	The code is poorly organized and very difficult to read. (1 points)
Documentation (5 points)	The code is self-documenting and obviates the need for elaborate documentation. It is well written and clearly explains what the code is accomplishing and how. (5 points)	The documentation is simply comments embedded in the code with some simple header comments separating functions/methods. (3 points)	The documentation is simply comments embedded in the code and does not help the reader understand the code. (2 points)

Figure 1: "Grading Rubric"