Comments for Zoe, Soren, Thomas Group

**Rubric**

* Documented project plan – 10 pts
* Pseudocode for each sub-problem – 5 pts
* Completion of the problem with functional code – 50 pts
* Well-organized and commented code – 10 pts
* Documented incremental progress on code via Github commits – 5 pts
* Within group review of code documented via Github issues and/or commits – 5 pts
* Efficient code – 5 pts
* Peer review of another group’s project documented in a text file – 10 pts

**Documented Project Plan**

It isn’t clear if the person doing the actual problem is also working on the pseudo code

**Psuedocode**

Currently, there is no pseudocode to look at.

**Functional Code**

There needs to be a title for the graph, also a legend for the colors. At a minimum, there needs to be a description in the file that shows what you have done. Which one is predator, which one is prey? Describe what happens when you change the parameters.

-perhaps comments

-perhaps graph it to show what happens

Do the other problems.

**Organization/Commenting**

There is little to no commenting throughout the code, explain what you are doing such as #setting up the model, #graphing the model, #setting the parameters, #explaining what the parameters are

**Documented Incremental Progress**

At the moment, you only have 4 commits and no issues on github. Other than your project plan, what evidences do you have that you actually divided the work?

**Within group review of code documented via Github issues or commits**

Same as before, if you have one student working on part of a problem, what evidences do you have that another student looked at it and attempted to make it more concise? Or even checked it?

**Efficient code**

The code is efficient for the problem completed