

	Exceeds Standards 10	Meets Standard 8	Partially Meets Standards 6	Not Evident 4
Design (50%)	The code is well-organized and well-documented . There are at most a few minor errors. Everything is clear and understandable without asking the student.	The program is mostly clear and understandable but the program may lack organization or have gaps in detail that hinder the reader's understanding. The student's understanding of the material is demonstrated in the creation of the design.	The program shows serious flaws in organization or detail . Discussion reveals that the student understands most of the relevant course content, but has not demonstrated this understanding in the final artifacts.	Significant portions of the program are not obvious to the reader, even with the supplied documentation. Many required deliverables missing, incomplete, or wrong. The program indicates lack of understanding of the relevant course materials.
Presentation (20%)	The student understands his/her program and can explain it clearly . The student speaks clearly and with adequate volume to be understood by the audience (not just the grader). The student understands questions as they are asked, and answers them precisely and promptly, with little need for followup questions.	The student understands his/her program , and can explain it . The student speaks clearly and with adequate volume to be understood by the audience (not just the grader). Follow up questions may be necessary in order to get to a precise answer.	The student has a general understanding of the program, but may be confused or is unable to explain some of the details. The student may not speak sufficiently clearly or with adequate volume to be understood by the audience (not just the grader).	The student's answers indicate lack of understanding of the program and of the relevant course materials. The student may require multiple rephrasings or followup questions in order to answer the question; some answers may remain unsatisfactory. The student may need to be asked repeatedly to speak more clearly or loudly.
Correctness (30%)	____/10 = ____			
Total	Design: <u> 4 </u> * 0.5 + Presentation: <u> 8 </u> * 0.2 + Correctness: <u> 0 </u> * .3 = <u> 3.6 </u>			

Overall Design:

Feature	Rating (5=excellent, 1=poor)
Abstraction	
Modularity	
Encapsulation	
Information hiding	
Separation of concerns	

Comments:

Contract and Design Strategy:

Feature	Rating (5=excellent, 1=poor)
Contracts specified for all methods	
Classes documented	
Interfaces documented	
One class, one responsibility	
Separation of concerns	
Discuss pros and cons of design Describe possible alternatives	
discuss the algorithmic complexity of their solution?	

Comments:

Code Quality

Feature	Rating (5=excellent, 1=poor)
Method simplicity (< 50 LoC)	
method/variable/constant/ parameters naming convention	
consistent use of named constants	
Immutable classes (where approp)	
Minimized mutable static state	
Class constructors	
variables documented	
appropriate tests (>90% coverage)	
check preconditions	
appropriate exception handling	
no duplicate code	
one task, one method	
Overall code readability	

Comments:

Notes:

I've been more than generous in allowing students to present the code that I pull as of 9am; next time I'm going to pull code at 6:15pm and you need to present what is there. We can't grade on submissions after 6. You've now experienced 2 times when the assignment has taken more time than you thought; plan ahead.

As we spoke in class, you flipped the pattern by having your Houses implement Visitable rather than the Candy. That's reasonable—it maps to the real world and makes semantic sense: some visitor goes to each house, and decides whether it can provide the desired candy. I also like that the visitor is named “HouseholdVisitor”—it just makes it easier for me to think about.

You encoded the historical data by hard coding it into the house. Think about another way to do this.

The assignment specifically calls out that this is a practice for tree data structures; What is the tree structure you implemented? It seems that your tree has one level, which makes it a list not a tree.

Your design score is low because so much is missing, per the rubric. What you have represents a good understanding and sense of design, but much is missing.