## Assignment # 3 – Advanced DOM

**Report Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2014  
Report Author: Neil Turner  
Prototype author: Nick Fenske**

## Prototype Defects and Corrections

**The table below lists any defects found in the prototype according to the assignment rubric. The weight corresponding to each criteria that was deficient is subtracted from the total possible marks.**

**If the prototype defects are corrected and resubmitted, your instructor will mark the resubmitted version.**

**The prototype author's grade will be 1/2 of the instructor's final assignment grade plus the 1/2 the prototype grade.**

**The other team members will all receive the instructor's final assignment grade.**

*Defects found and corrected by the Peer Review Team.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Weight | Details |
| General | 0 |  |
|  | 0 | Total deducted for defects. |
|  | 10 | Prototype grade out of 10. |
|  |  |  |

### Additional Comments:

**No defects found. Efficiently coded.**

## Participation Marks

**This is the team's evaluation of each member's participation on a scale of 0 to 10.   
(Where 0 = did not participate, and 10 = participated fully)**

Member Participation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mark | Team Member |
| 0 | Keith Tremorin |
| 10 | Neil Turner |
| 10 | Nick Fenske |
| 0 | Fiona Grant |

**A student can participate in the peer review process in a number of ways:**

* **Evaluate prototype against assignment specifications and rubric**
* **Apply corrections to prototype component(s)**
* **Upload corrected prototype component(s) into group's Student Web**
* **Author the Peer Review Report**