Deliverable	Evaluation	Points Given	Points Possible	Evaluation Criteria
PROJECT 10	*Grading TA*	**0**	**145**	
Build package		**0**	**102**	
	Builds without warnings		20	Successfully extracts from build file and builds without errors
	Coding style and traceability		10	Turtle code follows good coding style and traces to documentation in the writeup
	Unit test branch, data coverage		6	Full state chart branch coverage + up to 8 additional data coverage tests
	Unit test code style		6	Unit tests follow reasonable/good coding style
	Unit test traceability		10	All unit test transitions have a comment for the corresponding test in the code
	Unit test execution		25	All unit tests run and pass
	Runtime monitor source code		25	ANDREWID_turn_monitor.cpp source code apparently checks that turtle does not turn more than 90 degrees at a time by using ROS_WARN to indicate invariant violation
p10_writeup_[...].pdf		**0**	**39**	
	Q1. Unit tests		4	Describes which unit tests fail and why
	Q2. Unit test retrospective		4	Describes any struggles or concerns about unit testing
	Q3. Monitor		4	Describes any tricky or subtle issues with implementing monitor
	Q4. Invariant violations		4	If any invariant violations across all 6 mazes, explain the situation.
	Q5. Updated turtle statechart		10	Updated turtle design statechart (not unit test statechart)
	Q6. m1 screenshot		6	Screen shot showing maze 1 run reaches goal
	Q7. other maze screenshots		5	Screen shots showing attempts at mazes 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 (5 screen shots; multiple mazes per screen is OK)
	Q7 Feedback		2	Gives feedback for project, if any; Student name is stated in writeup
P10_[...].zip		**0**	**4**	
	Follows naming		4	All files follow the naming convention as instructed in the writeup
				Resubmission required if student name and andrew ID are not included as a comment in EVERY student-written testing file (as required by Proj 9)