Every grade started as “A”, then was decremented by one step (to A-, B+ etc.) for each major deficiency. A deficiency occurred whenever any of the following questions had a “no” answer (the sub-bullets describe or list various necessary ingredients of the major aspect):

- Did the document crisply restate the Challenge problem?
  - A concise restatement: all salient aspects included, and minimal fluff.
- Did the document distinguish assumptions from design decisions?
  - Assumptions: terrain character, block attributes, map contents, time, energy
  - Design decisions: robot shape, number of arms, sensor choice etc.
- Did the document describe the high-level approach, rather than just give details?
  - Even CDE’s by non-CS people should describe the system's high-level operation.
- Did the document include a system block diagram?
  - Did the block diagram represent both high- and low-level behaviors?
  - Were all edges labeled with inter-module dataflow/message semantics?
  - (Some students confused block diagrams with finite state machines.)
- Did the document discuss how to handle errors, failures, and unexpected events?
  - E.g., an unexpected collision, dropping a block, getting lost, etc.
- Did the document include concrete and credible development milestones?
  - Was an early architecture and specification effort proposed?
  - Did the milestones include concrete capability goals each week?
  - Did the milestones include stubbing, integration and testing early on?
  - (Non-EECS students were given a pass on pure software aspects.)
- Did the document include a coherent conclusion that was not just fluff?
  - Did the conclusion recapitulate the goals and high-level approach?

Most grades were A, A-, or B+; there were a few “R” grades (revise and resubmit for a grade).

Any student is welcome to revise and resubmit the CDE if s/he wishes to. If you do, make sure to include your original CDE, or a copy, so that we can reevaluate the resubmission in context.