Software Reengineering CS 789
Final Report Evaluation -- Group X

• **Delivery**: [ ] On-time [ ] Late: X days

• **Coverage of PR Categories (all four)**
  o [ ] Category 1 documented (cherry-pick succeeds with tests)
  o [ ] Category 2 documented (cherry-pick succeeds, missing tests written)
  o [ ] Category 3 documented (cherry-pick fails, RePatch succeeds)
  o [ ] Category 4 documented (cherry-pick fails, RePatch unresolved conflicts)

• **Design Recovery and Adaptation**
  o [ ] Class diagrams provided for affected PRs
  o [ ] Current design described clearly
  o [ ] Revised design/adaptation explained (integration impact on architecture)

• **Integration and Refactoring Activities**
  o [ ] Integration process described (cherry-pick, RePatch, manual fixes)
  o [ ] Refactorings applied are justified and documented
  o [ ] Evidence provided that restructurings are behavior-preserving
    - [ ] Successful compilation
    - [ ] Passing tests
    - [ ] Coverage maintained or improved

• **Testing and Coverage**
  o [ ] Existing tests confirmed to cover integrated PRs
  o [ ] New tests written where missing
  o [ ] Coverage before/after reported with screenshots or outputs
  o [ ] Adequacy of test suite discussed

• **Use of Tools and Techniques**
  o [ ] Tools from labs applied (metrics, visualization, mining, coverage, integration, refactoring)
  o [ ] Screenshots or outputs included for relevant tools
  o [ ] Reflection on tool effectiveness provided
  o [ ] Extra tools beyond labs (if any) described

• **Reengineering Patterns**
  o [ ] Patterns applied in context (design, integration, testing, refactoring)
  o [ ] Justifications for chosen patterns explained
  o [ ] Reflection on most useful patterns included

• **Effort and Risk Assessment**
  o [ ] Effort estimates documented (integration + testing)
  o [ ] Exceptional PRs identified (large/conflict-heavy)
  o [ ] Risks to maintainability or correctness discussed

• **Teamwork and Coordination**
  o [ ] Team coordination described (meetings, communication tools, peer reviews)

o [ ] Ad-hoc vs. systematic approach identified and reflected on
o [ ] Success criteria ("definition of done") addressed
o [ ] Timeline/milestones followed or adapted

- **Report Quality**
  o [ ] Structure: logical, follows project categories and activities
  o [ ] Layout: clear, readable, professional
  o [ ] Spelling & Grammar: acceptable
  o [ ] Evidence: screenshots, diagrams, logs included where relevant
  o [ ] Reasoning: decisions explained, not just results presented

- **Overall Evaluation**
  o [ ] Provides a sound, systematic reengineering process
  o [ ] Demonstrates lessons learned about variant-aware reengineering
  o [ ] Ready to serve as a reference for future projects