Name:	Christian Miller	Date:	Apr.	11	Start time:	End Time:
1. lr	nterpreted the ques	stion (1	Opts)			
a. 2 /2 points: Asked meaningful clarifying questions						
	b. 2 /2 points: Identified inputs and outputs c. 2 /2 points: Visually illustrated the problem domain					
	d. <u>4</u> /4 points: Ide	-			•	
	e. Notes:					
2. S	olved the technica	l proble	em (1	2pts)		
a. 4 /4 points: Presents a working pseudo-code solution						
	b. <u>3</u> /3 points: Co	ode was	synta	actical	ly correct	
	c. 3 /3 points: Code was idiomatically correct					
	d. 2 /2 points: So	lution v	vas th	e best	possible optic	on
	e. Notes:					
3. A	nalyzed the propos	sed sol	ution	(6pts))	
	a. 2 /2 points: St	epped t	hroug	gh thei	r solution	
	b. <u>0</u> /2 points: Big	g O time	e and	space	are analyzed	
	c. <u>1</u> /2 points: Ex	plain ar	n appr	roach t	to testing	
	d. Notes:					
4. C	communicated effe	ctively	throu	ghout	(12pts)	
a. 6_/6 points: Verbalized their thought process						
	b. 2 /2 points: Us	sed corr	ect te	rmino	logy	
	c. <u>1</u> /1 point: Use	ed the ti	me av	/ailable	e effectively	
	d. <u>1</u> /1 point: Wa	s not ov	ercor/	nfident	(not listening	to suggestions)
	e. <u>1</u> /1 point: Wa	s not ur	nder-c	onfide	ent (unsure of k	(nown algorithm)
	f. <u>0</u> /1 point: Wh	iteboard	d was	reada	ble (penmansh	nip and spacing)
	g. Notes: Handwi	riting wa	as fine	e, but c	organization of	board needs
	work					
	36 /40 Total poin	te				