

Open-Source project: Evaluation sheet

Group

Topic:

Names and initials:

-
-
-
-
-

Development work (weight: 70%)

Criterion	Score (1-5)
1. Competence to use git	
2. Competence to write Python code and contribute to a Python package	
3. Quality of code (concise, passing linters and tests)	
4. Open-Source organizing (e.g., atomic commits, use of branches and pull requests to review, discuss, revise, and test the code)	
5. Code can be merged	
6. Documentation (in the code or separately)	
7. Quality (as evaluated in the last session)	

- Each team member contributed equally as per RepoSense (yes / no)
- Explanation of differences in grading in case of unequal contributions:

- Notes:

Code review session (weight: 30%)

Note: if the code does not work, the review can be completed online by assessing the source files linked in the pull request. Major issues identified can be considered in the *development work* section of the respective group.

Criterion	Score (1-5)
1. Completion of local code review setup (pull, switch)	
2. Testing of the code (code was installed, debugged if necessary, tested)	
3. Code review provided in the pull request (substance of suggestions related to functionality, consideration of documentation and code quality, constructive tone)	
4. General competence in the code review (based on the questions asked and the type of assistance needed)	

- Comments on the project (team work, challenges, and potential improvements)

- Suggestions for follow-up projects (CoLRev)

- Notes:

Overall grade

Part	Points	Overall
Development	_____ * 2	
Code review	_____ * 1.5	
Sum		
Grade		

Scales: **1.0** (100 - 95), **1.3** (... 89), **1.7** (... 83), **2.0** (... 77), **2.3** (... 71), **2.7** (... 65), **3.0** (... 59), **3.3** (... 53), **3.7** (... 47), **4.0** (... 41), **4.3** (... 35), **4.7** (... 29), **5.0** (... 20).

Evaluator

Signature and name (date): _____ , _____ (_____)