

Software Engineering Design Final Exam: Peer Review System

Prof. Jonathan Lee (李允中)

CSIE Department

National Taiwan University




Points for Each Software Artifact

- ☐ (37 points) Initial Design
- ☐ (33 points) Refactor Design
- ☐ (5 points) Mapping
- ☐ (25 points) Test Cases
- ☐ (10 points) Feedbacks



- 3



Requirements Statement₂

| | Level | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Criterion | Excellent | Competent | Needs work |
| Knowledge/ Understanding | The presentation demonstrates a depth of historical understanding by using relevant and accurate detail to support the student's thesis. Research is thorough and goes beyond what was presented in class or in the assigned texts. | The presentation uses knowledge which is generally accurate with only minor inaccuracies, and which is generally relevant to the student's thesis. Research is adequate but does not go much beyond what was presented in class or in the assigned text. | The presentation uses little relevant or accurate information, not even that which was presented in class or in the assigned texts. Little or no research is apparent. |
| Thinking/ Inquiry | The presentation is centered around a thesis which shows a highly developed awareness of historiographic or social issues and a high level of conceptual ability. | The presentation shows an analytical structure and a central thesis, but the analysis is not always fully developed and/or linked to the thesis. | The presentation shows no analytical structure and no central thesis. |
| Communication | The presentation is imaginative and effective in conveying ideas to the audience. The presenter responds effectively to audience reactions and questions | Presentation techniques used are effective in conveying main ideas, but a bit unimaginative. Some questions from the audience remain unanswered. | The presentation fails to capture the interest of the audience and/or is confusing in what is to be communicated. |
| Use of visual aids | The presentation includes appropriate and easily understood visual aids which the presenter refers to and explains at appropriate moments in the presentation. | The presentation includes appropriate visual aids, but these are too few, in a format that makes them difficult to use or understand, and/or the presenter does not refer to or explain them in the presentation. | The presentation includes no visual aids or visual aids that are inappropriate, and/or too small or messy to be understood. The presenter makes no mention of them in the presentation. |



Requirements Statement₃

- ❑ After the peer review, the instructor can see the score of each student, and the average in each criterion. The score information can help the instructor understand the strength and weakness of each student.

- ❑ Other requirements:
 - Each rubric has three levels: *excellent*, *competent* and *needs work*. The scores are 3, 2 and 1, respectively. However, the level may change in the future since different schools may have different strategies.
 - A student's score is ranked by averaging the scores from their reviewers. But the rule may be changed in the future - some instructors think using median is more reasonable.