

## CSCI 241 Data Structures

### Project 1: A Battle of Sorts

Your submission for project 1 will be graded according to the following rubric. You will receive a score in each category. Your total project score will be the sum of all category scores. Categories and their weights may change with each project.

Implementation					
	Exemplary A	Good B	Satisfactory C	Marginal D	Unacceptable F
<b>Adherence to Specifications 10 points</b>	There are no deviations from the specifications. Items are named correctly. Files are named correctly and all files are present.	Most components adhere to specifications. Some issues remain. Examples may include spelling or case of specified names or other editorially minor issues.	Many components meet specifications, but key elements are incorrect. Examples include algorithmic deviations from what we covered in class, or use of built-in Python features instead of custom implementations.	The submission attempts to follow instructions, but fundamental issues persist. There is a clear lack of understanding of the specifications and how they relate to the material.	The submission may be substantially incomplete. It may be missing specified components. It may implement items in ways other than specified or covered. The submission conveys ignorance or illiteracy of specifications.
<b>Functionality 15 points</b>	The submission passes all test cases. Output is formatted correctly, with no unspecified output. Main code is conditioned to be separate from definitions.	The submission produces the correct result, but minor issues such as formatting remain.	There is evidence that the implementation does not consider problematic cases or special cases. The program may crash on a few test cases.	The implementation is fundamentally incorrect. Multiple cases fail, or the program crashes in multiple scenarios. The submission fails to convey sufficient understanding.	The program crashes on most inputs. It contains errors that imply it could not have run during development. Of the test cases that do not crash, many fail with incorrect results.
<b>Score    /25</b>	<hr/>				

Writeup					
	Exemplary A	Good B	Satisfactory C	Marginal D	Unacceptable F
<b>Data Presentation 10 points each</b>	Data adhere to specifications of the project in both quantity and content, and demonstrate that correct conditions were tested. Tables and figures are properly labelled and graphical elements have been constructed to enhance readability. All required data are presented.	Data adhere to specifications of the project in both quantity and content. Some graphical elements may be inconsistent between graphs, but graphical elements are legible. There may be some minor errors such as spelling errors in labels.	Data presented include data not asked for in the specifications and/or a small amount of required data is missing. Readability compromised to some degree; for example, missing labels, but data are still apparent.	Excessive amounts of additional data are included and/or several required data points are missing. Graphs are difficult to read and are missing some labels or incorrectly labelled. Overall trends in data are visible but hard to distinguish.	Data presented are not data specified in the instructions or no data is presented. Graphs are not labeled, are difficult to read. Data are presented in incorrect format such as a table instead of a graph.
<b>Prose Writeup 15 points each</b>	The writeup is concise and indicates a deep understanding of the material at hand. It integrates and employs references to illustrations, prose explanations, and examples to justify claims. It describes in detail the algorithmic steps that lead to performance variations at current level (for Project 1, this is not formal performance analysis). The document adheres to length limitations and contains few if any grammatical errors.	The writeup is content-complete and generally correct, but presentation is lacking. It may fail to justify some claims with illustrations or examples. It indicates that the general concepts are clearly understood, but minor improvements in presentation would benefit the reader. Portions of the writeup could be made more concise without sacrificing detail.	The writeup convers the specified material, but in an incomplete way. It draws some incorrect conclusions, or offers incorrect or incomplete justifications. Many portions could be made more concise without sacrificing detail. Minimal effort to distinguish this submission among others is present.	The writeup is not structured as a prose document, or contains only cursory responses to the required items. The writeup appears to have been an afterthought of the implementation instead of an integral component of the project. The prose is unnecessarily verbose. No effort to distinguish this submission among others is present.	The writeup is missing or fails to address the required items. If it is present, it is so brief as to indicate a lack of sufficient time, analysis, and construction of rational argument.
25 pts increasing 25 pts decreasing 25 pts random <b>Score     /75</b>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/>				