CSC 260 Fall 2012

Rubric for Assignment 4 – Abstraction and Aggregation Part I Due: October 16, 2012 by midnight Part II Due: October 26, 2012 by midnight

| Student Name: | Grade: | /60 |
|---------------|--------|-----|
|---------------|--------|-----|

| | Levels of Achievement | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|
| Criteria | Exceeds Expectations (4) | Meets Minimum Expectations (3) | Below Expectations (0) | Score | | | |
| Compiling and Execution | Compiles without errors or warnings. There are no execution errors. | | There are compile errors or warnings or many execution errors. | | | | |
| | Note: Assignment is Incomplete if the pro- | gram does not compile without errors. It must b | e re-submitted after fixing errors. | | | | |
| Class Diagram | Provides a detailed class diagram including all classes and their relationships in correct UML notation. | Provides a minimal class diagram in mostly correct UML notation. | Provides a trivial or no class diagram, or uses incorrect UML notation. | | | | |
| Statechart for System | Provides detailed statechart for system behavior in correct UML notation. | Provides minimal diagram, or only for parts of the system in correct UML notation. | Provides a trivial or no statechart, or uses incorrect UML notation. | | | | |
| Statechart for Operators | Provides detailed diagram with elegant algorithms in correct UML notation. | Provides minimal diagram or inelegant algorithms in mostly correct UML notation. | Provides a trivial or no statechart, or uses incorrect UML notation. | | | | |
| Test Case Design | Provides detailed test case design that will demonstrate all functionality and exception handling. | Provides minimal test case design that will demonstrate some functionality and exception handling. | Provides a trivial or no test case design, or does not demonstrate most functionality or exception handling. | | | | |
| Functionality | Provides all functionality as per specs, and does not implement user i/o in functions except where required. | Provides most functionality as per specs, and may implement some inappropriate user i/o in functions. | Does not provide most significant functionality, and implements user i/o inappropriately in most functions. | | | | |
| Problem Solution | Implements correct, elegant and efficient algorithms. | Implements working but inelegant algorithms. | Implements incorrect algorithms that do not meet specifications. | | | | |
| Overloading Operators | Elegantly handles operator overloading to meet all the requirements. | Trivially handles operator overloading to meet some of the requirements. | Does not implement operator overloading as specified. | | | | |
| Templates | Elegantly implements template classes to meet all the requirements. | Trivially implements template classes to meet some of the requirements. | Does not implement template classes as specified. | | | | |
| Use of OOP and C++ | Implements excellent encapsulation and information hiding with appropriate level of modularity. Makes excellent use of C++ constructs and parameter passing and does not use global variables. | There is some violation of encapsulation and information hiding, with inadequate modularity. There is some inappropriate use of C++ constructs, parameter passing or global variables. | Does not satisfy encapsulation or information hiding and is not modular. There is considerable inappropriate use of C++ constructs and global variables. | | | | |

CSC 260 Fall 2012

| | Levels of Achievement | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Criteria | Exceeds Expectations (4) | Meets Minimum Expectations (3) | Below Expectations (0) | Score |
| Programming Practices | Indents and formats code well, with consistent placement of braces and tab spacing, to improve readability. | Indents and formats code for most part, with some inconsistent placement of braces and tab spacing that hinders readability. | Does not indent or format code so that readability is severely hindered. | |
| | Organizes classes and methods well, and uses good and consistent naming convention to promote reuse and ease of maintenance. | Provides mostly well-organized classes and methods, and uses mostly consistent naming convention that promote reuse and ease of maintenance. | Does not organize classes or methods, or uses unintuitive naming convention, severely constraining reuse and ease of maintenance. | |
| Documentation | Provides detailed identification information and clear and detailed comments as appropriate. | Provides minimum identification information and/or minimal comments as appropriate. | Does not provide identification information or appropriate comments. | |
| Exception Handling | Implements graceful error handling within methods. | Implements minimal error handling or distributes it between methods and driver. | Implements no error handling within methods. | |
| Testing | Demonstrates extensive testing of all functionality and exception handling guided by the test case design. | Demonstrates some testing of functionality and exception handling, not necessarily guided by the test case design. | Does not adequately demonstrate functionality and exception handling. | |
| Deliverables | 6 points penalty for posting source code on the wiki or team's svn repository. | | | |
| Timeliness | 6 points penalty for each day late. | | | |

Comments: