# Microcontroller Based Systems (CCE2014)
## Final Audit
### Prof. Johann A. Briffa

Group Number: | 2

| Description | | Grade |
|---|---|---|

**Team Management – agendas: [15%]**

Planning was adequate. Agendas submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Items for discussion are mostly standard items, but are generally clear.

> Help
> 65%

**Team Management – minutes: [15%]**

Basic documentation of meetings only. Minutes submitted for every meeting, though some may be submitted late. Descriptions of discussion may be unclear.

> Help
> 50%

**Documentation – SVN logs, design documentation, naming conventions: [20%]**

The documentation is maintained and reflects a basic understanding of the project with some significant inconsistencies and/or omissions. Naming conventions are followed with some short-comings.

> Help
> 50%

**Structure of source code: [20%]**

An appropriate amount of code is provided and the code follows professional object-oriented practice to an excellent degree. The code is excellently structured and readable.

> Help
> 85%

**Code comments and technical documentation: [20%]**

The code is commented, both using Javadoc and normal comments, however with some inconsistencies and/or omissions. Comments can be improved with respect to relevance, conciseness and completeness. They may have some shortcomings.

> Help
> 60%

**Prototype:**

Project checked out from trunk of the group's SVN repository compiles without errors: [10%]   ✔

**Overall Grade:** | 66%

Briefly justify the overall grade, and give additional feedback.

Agendas and minutes stored in subfolders, not using naming convention requested. Otherwise most meetings seem well planned. In later week, several agenda items are not discussion items, but work to be done; it's not clear if these were discussion/progress meetings or something else. Minutes numbering doesn't match agenda. Minutes are generally very sparse, not enough to indicate what was discussed and agreed.

Design documentation not updated beyond Feb 13. Why not include photos of the actual finished product in the design document? Also, wiring diagrams / pinout use not documented. Testing not documented.

Code is divided into separate modules with a number of functions each. Most of these are documented, but some are completely devoid of documentation.

## Instructions

The group examiner should complete this assessment. When complete, this is to be submitted on the following folder on SVN:

    https://username@cce2014-ict.research.um.edu.mt/svn/CCE2014/2018-2019/assessment/audit-final/

The filename should be `audit-final-XX.pdf`, where `XX` is the two-digit group number. *Please follow the naming convention strictly as a script will be used to collect grades.* All grades are to be considered provisional until Board of Examiners approval.

# Marking Criteria

**Team Management – agendas: [15%]**

**0%–44%:** Insufficient planning for meetings. Agendas often missing or contain only very vague or generic points. There is usually little to differentiate one meeting from another.

**45%–49%:** Limited planning for meetings. Some agendas missing; the others mostly consist of standard items for discussion only.

**50%–54%:** Basic planning only. Agendas submitted for every meeting, though some may be submitted late. Items for discussion are mostly standard items; some may be unclear.

**55%–64%:** Basic planning only. Agendas submitted for every meeting, though some may be submitted late. Items for discussion are mostly standard items, but are generally clear.

**65%–69%:** Planning was adequate. Agendas submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Items for discussion are mostly standard items, but are generally clear.

**70%–74%:** Planning was at a near professional level and reflects good organisational skills. Agendas submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Items for discussion are mostly standard items, but are generally clear.

**75%–79%:** Planning was at a professional level and reflects very good organisational skills. Agendas submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Items for discussion are generally clear.

**80%–94%:** Planning was at a professional level and reflects excellent organisational skills. Agendas submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Items for discussion are always clear and substantive.

**95%–100%:** Planning was at a professional level and reflects exceptional organisational skills. Agendas submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Items for discussion are always clear and substantive.

**Team Management – minutes: [15%]**

**0%–44%:** Insufficient documentation of meetings. Minutes often missing or contain only very vague or generic discussion points. There is usually little to differentiate one meeting from another.

**45%–49%:** Limited documentation of meetings. Some minutes missing; the others mostly consist of standard discussion points only.

**50%–54%:** Basic documentation of meetings only. Minutes submitted for every meeting, though some may be submitted late. Descriptions of discussion may be unclear.

**55%–64%:** Basic documentation of meetings only. Minutes submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Descriptions of discussion may occasionally be unclear.

**65%–69%:** Documentation of meetings was adequate. Minutes submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Descriptions of discussion are generally clear. Action points, listed separately, may be unclear or occasionally missing.

**70%–74%:** Documentation of meetings was at a near professional level and reflects good organisational skills. Minutes submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Descriptions of discussion are generally clear. Action points, listed separately, may be unclear or occasionally missing.

**75%–79%:** Documentation of meetings was at a professional level and reflects very good organisational skills. Minutes submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Descriptions of discussion are generally clear. Action points, listed separately, are generally clear.

**80%–94%:** Documentation of meetings was at a professional level and reflects excellent organisational skills. Minutes submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Descriptions of discussion are always clear and substantive. Action points, listed separately, are always clear.

**95%–100%:** Documentation of meetings was at a professional level and reflects exceptional organisational skills. Minutes submitted for every meeting, and are always on time. Descriptions of discussion are always clear and substantive. Action points, listed separately, are always clear.

**Documentation – SVN logs, design documentation, naming conventions: [20%]**

**0%–44%:** The limited documentation provided is incoherent and/or misrepresents substantial parts of the project. Naming of files misrepresents the naming conventions.

**45%–49%:** The documentation is maintained at a limited level and reflects a limited understanding of the project with inconsistencies and/or omissions. Limited adherence to naming conventions.

**(Continued on next page)**

| Grade | Description |
|---|---|
| **50%–54%:** | The documentation is maintained and reflects a basic understanding of the project with some significant inconsistencies and/or omissions. Naming conventions are followed with some short-comings. |
| **55%–64%:** | The documentation is maintained and reflects a basic understanding of the project with some inconsistencies and/or omissions. Naming conventions are followed with some short-comings. |
| **65%–69%:** | The documentation is maintained at a near professional level and reflects an adequate understanding of the project with some inconsistencies and/or omissions. Naming conventions are followed meticulously, perhaps with minor and obvious short-comings. |
| **70%–74%:** | The documentation is maintained at a near professional level and reflects a good understanding of the project with only some minor inconsistencies and/or omissions. Naming conventions are followed meticulously, perhaps with minor and obvious short-comings. |
| **75%–79%:** | The complete documentation is maintained at a professional level and reflects a substantive understanding of the project. Naming conventions are followed meticulously. |
| **80%–94%:** | The complete documentation is maintained at a professional level and reflects an excellent understanding of the project. Naming conventions are followed meticulously. |
| **95%–100%:** | The complete documentation is maintained at a professional level and reflects an exceptional understanding of the project. Naming conventions are followed meticulously. |

**Structure of source code: [20%]**

| Grade | Description |
|---|---|
| **0%–44%:** | A limited amount of code is provided and the code mainly fails to follow professional object-oriented practice. The lack of clear structure severely impacts readability. Alternatively, too little code has been provided to assess adherence to object-oriented practice, structure and readability. |
| **45%–49%:** | A limited amount of code is provided and the code follows professional object-oriented practice with considerable shortcomings. The code is only partly structured, affecting readability. |
| **50%–54%:** | A fair amount of code is provided and the code follows professional object-oriented practice with some significant shortcomings. The code is only partly structured, but still readable. |
| **55%–64%:** | A fair amount of code is provided and the code follows professional object-oriented practice with some shortcomings. The code is only partly structured, but still readable. |
| **65%–69%:** | An appropriate amount of code is provided and the code follows professional object-oriented practice with a few shortcomings. The code is mostly well structured and readable. |
| **70%–74%:** | An appropriate amount of code is provided and the code follows professional object-oriented practice with a few minor shortcomings. The code is mostly well structured and readable. |
| **75%–79%:** | An appropriate amount of code is provided and the code follows professional object-oriented practice to an advanced degree. The code is very well structured and readable. |
| **80%–94%:** | An appropriate amount of code is provided and the code follows professional object-oriented practice to an excellent degree. The code is excellently structured and readable. |
| **95%–100%:** | An appropriate amount of code is provided and the code follows professional object-oriented practice to an exceptional degree. The code is exceptionally structured and readable. |

**Code comments and technical documentation: [20%]**

| Grade | Description |
|---|---|
| **0%–44%:** | The code is commented in an incoherent or misleading way. Many comments are lacking or do not contain relevant information. |
| **45%–49%:** | The code is commented at a limited level with inconsistencies and/or omissions. Comments are not concise and complete. |
| **50%–54%:** | The code is commented, both using Javadoc and normal comments, however with some significant inconsistencies and/or omissions. Comments can be improved with respect to relevance, conciseness and completeness. They may have some shortcomings. |
| **55%–64%:** | The code is commented, both using Javadoc and normal comments, however with some inconsistencies and/or omissions. Comments can be improved with respect to relevance, conciseness and completeness. They may have some shortcomings. |
| **65%–69%:** | The code is commented adequately, both using Javadoc and normal comments. Comments are mostly relevant, concise and complete, and may have minor shortcomings. |
| **70%–74%:** | The code is commented at a near professional standard, both using Javadoc and normal comments. Comments are mostly relevant, concise and complete, and may have minor short-comings. |
| **75%–79%:** | The code is commented at good professional standard, both using Javadoc and normal comments. Comments are relevant, concise and complete. Javadoc comments are syntactically correct. |

| Grade | Description |
|---|---|
| **80%–94%:** | The code is commented at an excellent professional standard, both using Javadoc and normal comments. Comments are relevant, concise and complete. Javadoc comments are syntactically correct. |
| **95%–100%:** | The code is commented at an exceptional professional standard, both using Javadoc and normal comments. Comments are relevant, concise and complete. Javadoc comments are syntactically correct. |