Group X -- Final Report Evaluation
Names

Sufficient [D+ – D]
[ ] Do they describe the distilled design from the available data? i.e. a UML diagram
[ ] Do they describe the transformation from the old design to the new design based on the requirements and the distilled design?
[ ] Are the code changes tested adequately?
[ ] Are the techniques as seen in the lab sessions applied sufficiently?

Distinction [C – C-]
[ ] Scoping: Are refactorings motivated (at design level) in function of the future changes (=target of the reengineering exercise)?
[ ] Are unchosen alternatives highlighted?
[ ] Are the reengineering patterns used in their own process and do they recognize these patterns?
[ ] Is there documentation for the reverse-engineered and the target design (design patterns, architecture patterns, architecture styles)?
[ ] Is there efficient testing in function of refactorings (i.e. more than just blind unit/regression testing)

Great Distinction [B+ – B-]
[ ] Is the end solution (=refactored design) evaluated with the requirements in mind.
- they implemented a new feature, made a cost assessment, risk analysis, etc ….
[ ] Are the techniques applied according to a plan?
[ ] Was the application of techniques adapted based on their efficiency? Iterations + not just according to the book, but deliberate use of the most appropriate reengineering pattern.
[ ] Did their process show a deeper insight into the application of the techniques?

Greatest distinction [A – A-]
[ ] Did the reflect on the process and/or the result?
[ ] Did they try to create more efficient variants of reengineering patterns and did they formally document these?
[ ] Was the tradeoff and/or reengineering process reusable to other representative reengineering projects?

Fine-Grained Criteria Used to determine the grade within the category.
[ ] Scoping - Degree in which the impact on the source code was investigated and limited.
[ ] Patterns - Degree in which the reengineering patterns were used and recognized in their own process.
[ ] Reflection - Degree in which the project report shows a critical reflection on the applied process and translated into a learning process.
[ ] Groups - Efficiency in which the process used the available manpower and how was the process directed.
[ ] Reports - The quality of the previous reports submitted for this course.