Peer Feedback
Deadline: 13:00 Tuesday 8th October
Deliverable: 2 text files entitled *USERNAME_feedback.txt* (the username from the submission the feedback is about)
Assessment: Required to receive credit for *rot18.c* submission

When the submission deadline has been reached, we'll put all final submissions in the Files folder of the General channel of the unit 'Teams' group and tell you which 2 usernames you are assessing. Write some brief feedback about the programs you've been assigned and upload each to the Blackboard submission point. When you give feedback, you should use the following guidelines:

- If the file has been submitted late then we'll rename it to have _late in the name. In this case, take 10 off the final mark (a University rule).
- Our system will automatically prefix your username to the filename. Apart from this, if the file was misnamed in any way, even just using a .C rather than a .c extension, take 5 off the final mark.

Where a category has a fixed mark (e.g. choose 0 or 10), decide which of these two marks to award. Where a category has a range of marks (e.g. 0 – 20), apply the following guidelines:

50% Just OK – room for improvement.
60% Good, solid work - what you might expect.
70% Above and beyond what we would expect at this stage of the unit (just).
80% We could publish this, ground-breaking - it'll change how we teach this unit in the future!

So, if a category can be marked in the range 0 – 20, a very good piece of work might score 13 marks, for instance.

FLAGS	**0 or 10**
GOTO + TABS + INDENT	**0 – 10**
BRACE	**0 – 5**
NAMES	**0 – 5**
REPC	**0 – 5**
LLEN	**0 – 5**
MAIN	**0 – 5**
CAPS	**0 – 5**
FLEN including main(), excluding test function	**0 – 5**
MAGIC	**0 – 5**
BRIEF	**0 – 5**
Are all functions thoroughly tested using a test function?	**0 – 20**
Does the program work correctly?	**0 or 5**

An example is given below:

This program compiled for me without warnings and was correctly named. The code was consistently indented, but you used tabs not spaces as required. Function names could have been improved upon - e.g. doit() is not very helpful. One function (extra()) seems quite long. You used a 'magic number': 65. The testing was quite thorough and the program worked well. Overall, I'd give this 59% - nicely done, but pay closer attention to the style guidelines!