| Area | Subdivision | Item | Criteria |
|-------------|---|------------------------------------|---|
| Programming | Basic coding | Code | Consistent naming and layout |
| Design | | | Judicious use of comments, especially for failure paths |
| | | | Reasonable function and module length |
| | | | No duplicated code |
| | | | Idiomatic use of language, including avoidance of bad parts |
| | | | Appropriate and skillful use of advanced language features |
| | | | Appropriate use of known algorithms and data structures |
| | | | Appropriate use of libraries |
| | | | Citations for borrowed code and ideas |
| | Modularity | Code | Code sensibly divided into modules and files |
| | , | | Namespace, structured and coherent |
| | | | Separation of concerns (especially presentation/content) |
| | | | Clean and simple module interfaces |
| | | | Data types immutable when possible |
| | | | Abstract data types used when appropriate |
| | | | Abstraction barriers not violated |
| | | | Inter-module dependences controlled |
| | | | Design decisions localized as much as possible |
| | | Specifications | Succinct but informative specifications for public interfaces |
| | | | Preconditions given, especially on session state |
| | Verification | Runtime assertions | Runtime assertions to check non-trivial expectations |
| | | | Representation invariants for abstract types |
| | | | Schema invariants declared, maintained (& checked if appropriate |
| | | Unit tests of public interfaces | Repeatable suite of tests for key methods of service interfaces |
| | Security | Code | Appropriate use of security mitigations (eg, sanitization) |
| | Overview | Purpose and goals | Access control mechanisms implemented, as relevant |
| | | | Safe defaults used |
| | | | Brief description of system to be built |
| | O T CI VICVV | . s.pose and goals | Key goals and purpose |
| | | | Motivation for development (eg, deficiencies of existing solutions) |
| | | Context diagram | Establishes boundary of system |
| | | | Interactions between system and external entities |
| | Concents | Vou concents | Brief explanation of key enabling concepts |
| | Concepts | Key concepts | , |
| | | Object model | Object model describing main state components |
| | | | Implementation details excluded |
| | | | Small details that don't impact behavior omitted or abstracted Syntactically valid diagram with consistent naming & layout |
| | | | Generalization used appropriately |
| | | | Names of sets and relations well chosen |
| | | | Definitions in accompanying text of non-obvious elements |
| | Daharian | Facture descriptions | |
| | Behavior | Feature descriptions | Succinct but precise descriptions of each feature |
| | | Security concerns | Summary of key security requirements and how addressed |
| | | | How standard attacks are mitigated |
| | | Licar interface | Threat model: assumptions about attackers |
| | | User interface | Wireframes for application |
| | | | Flow between pages indicated, with named actions |
| | CL II | 5 : 1 !! | Errors accounted for |
| | Challenges | Design challenges | List of problems to resolve in concepts, behaviors or implementation |
| | | | For each problem: options available, evaluation, which chosen |
| | F | C iv | Note on code design: schema design choices, abstractions |
| | Evaluation | Critique | Summary assessment from user's perspective |
| | | | Summary assessment from developer's perspective |
| | | | Most and least successful decisions |
| | | | Priorities for improvement |
| | | Reflection | Most and least successful aspects of project |
| | | | What I learned from it and can improve on next time |
| Геат Work | Plan | Stakeholders | List of stakeholders and their roles |
| | | Resources | List of computational, cost and time constraints |
| | | Tasks | List of tasks, expected effort, allocation to team members |
| | | | Calendar of intermediate and final milestones for tasks |
| | | Risks | Enumeration of expected risks and their mitigations |
| | | Minimum viable product | Identification of minimum viable product for first release |
| | | | Subset of features to be included |
| | | | Issues postponed (eg, security mitigations, user interface elements) |
| | | | Provides real value to users |
| | | | Provides opportunity for feedback |
| | | | On path to full product |
| | Team contract | Team contract | Expected level of achievement and effort for each team member |
| | r carri contract | . cam conduct | Personal goals for each team member |
| | | | Frequency, length and location of team meetings |
| | | | , , , |
| | | | How quality of work will be maintained How tasks will be assigned, and what to do if deadlines are missed. |
| | | | How designer will be assigned, and what to do if deadlines are missed |
| | Mootings | Agenda | How decisions will be made and disagreements resolved |
| | Meetings | Agenda | One agenda for each meeting |
| | | Progress report | Agenda prepared in advance of meeting |
| | | | One report for each meeting, prepared in advance |
| | | | Summarizes progress since previous meeting |
| | | | Identifies achieved and missed milestones |
| | | | Identifies difficulties encountered |
| | | A A o o t i m = m= i m · · · · · · | Identifies changes found in problem or constraints |
| | | Meeting minutes | Summary of discussions and advice from mentor |
| | | | Summary of new decisions |
| | | | Changes to plan or milestones |
| | ~- | D | Constructive but candid evaluations of team mate performance |
| | Reflection | Peer review | • |
| | Reflection | Evaluation Lessons learned | Evaluation of project from team planning perspective Summary of key lessons learned |