**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