

Assignment No. 4 Rubric  
EECS 348 – Software Engineering I  
Due: 11:59 PM, Thursday, October 9, 2025

**Student: Vincent Vordtriede**

**Student ID: 3133400**

### Point Breakdown

<i>Graded Value</i>	<i>Points Possible</i>	<i>Criteria</i>
	0	Your assignment will receive a zero and not be graded unless the following are submitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Name of the zip file: FirstnameLastname_Assignment4 (with your first and last name). Files in other formats (e.g., .tar will not be graded).</li><li>• Name of the Assignment folder within the zip file: FirstnameLastname_Assignment4</li><li>• Copy of Rubric 4.docx.</li><li>• Python file named: Assignment4.py</li><li>• UML Use Case Diagram Requirements Artifact in PDF</li><li>• UML Class Diagram Design Artifact in PDF</li></ul>
	20	UML Use Case Diagram is consistent with the specified requirements and is concise, descriptive, and unique.
	20	UML Class Diagram is consistent with the Python code and is concise, descriptive, and unique.
	5	All 33 properties in “Boolean Properties.pdf” are listed correctly; 0 points if one or more is incorrect
	5	The Python RHS is correct for all 33 properties in “Boolean Properties.pdf”; 0 points if one or more is incorrect
	5	The Python LHS is correct for all 33 properties in “Boolean Properties.pdf”; 0 points if one or more is incorrect
	20	Based on the percentage of the 33 tables that are correct.
	25	Software is adequately commented.
	<b>100 pts</b>	

Rubric for Program Comments		
Exceeds Expectations (90-100%)	Meets Expectations (80-89%)	Unsatisfactory (0-79%)
Software is adequately commented with prologue comments, comments summarizing major blocks of code, and comments on every line.	Prologue comments are present but missing some items or some major blocks of code are not commented or there are inadequate comments on each line.	Prologue comments are missing all together or there are no comments on major blocks of code or there are very few comments on each line.

Adequate Prologue Comments:

- Name of program contained in the file (e.g., EECS 348 Assignment 1)
- Brief description of the program, e.g., CEO Email prioritization program
- Inputs e.g., test file labeled Assignment1\_Test\_File.txt
- Output, e.g., Next email and number of unread emails
- All collaborators
- Other sources for the code ChatGPT, stackOverflow, etc.
- Author's full name
- Creation date: The date you first create the file, i.e., the date you write this comment

Adequate comments summarizing major blocks of code and comments on every line:

- Provide comments that explain what each line of code is doing.
- You may comment each line of code and/or provide a multi-line comment that explains what a group of lines does.
- Multi-line comments should be detailed enough that it is clear what each line of code is doing.
- Each block of code must indicate whether you authored the code, you obtained it from one of the sources listed in the prolog, or one of your collaborators authored the code, or if it was a combination of all of these.

Collaboration and other sources for code:

- When you collaborate with other students or use other sources for the code (e.g., ChatGPT, stackOverflow):
  - Your comments must be significantly different from your collaborators.
  - More scrutiny will be applied to grading your comments in particular explaining the code "in your own words", not the source's comments (e.g., ChatGPT's comments).
- Failure to identify collaborators or other sources of code will not only result in a 0 on the assignment but will be considered an act of Academic Misconduct.
- Students who violate conduct policies will be subject to severe penalties, up through and

including dismissal from the School of Engineering.

### **Grader Comments**