Post-Mortem

Assignment 07

March 25, 2018

We publish the post-mortem for an assignment after it has been marked and released. Here is a list of common mistakes provided by the graders for assignment 7.

General

• As usual, it is advised to ensure your code runs before submitting.
• A few students were found to have black highlighting in their code.
• Students are still not referencing their parameter names in their purpose.
• Very few students wrote all the required test cases.
• Many students are still giving ambiguous or non-meaningful names to their parameters and helper functions. In particular, ambiguous function names such as accumulate, recurse, helper, and function are some of the many poor function names that markers encountered.
• Some students did not complete the assignment.

Question 2

• For 2(c), many students struggled to handle the case where a new node must be added to the tree.
• For 2(c), a few students misinterpreted the question and replaced the count of an item with the given value, instead of adding it to the original value.
• For all parts, many students forgot to test the case where the tree was empty.
• Overall, this question was done quite well.

Question 3

• Many students did not complete this question.
• Many students got the contract incorrect for 3(b).
• For 3(d), many students omitted the test case where the ShapeList is empty.
• For 3(d), some students did not produce the ShapeID in the Picture when the ShapeID is not found in the ShapeList.
• For 3(e), some students did not finish or had an overly complicated solution.
• For 3(e), some students did not write a helper function to deal with a component but instead recurse on the main function, which is correct but messy, and thus we deducted a few marks in the helper function category.