

Code Inspection FXML files, Controller

Full disclosure: I made some edits to this code to incorporate my own ScheduleView, probably should not have done this code review, or should have done so before my changes

Moderator: Hunter

Author: Eyan

- Fxml files are understandable when opened in SceneBuilder, code in controller is readable, functions are small and have good naming conventions
- Very little documentation, comments restate the name of function, inadequate
- Not described, but controller contains all driving code for fxml views
- Methods describe when they are called, not what they do, variables are descriptive
- Naming conventions consistent
- One controller for all fxml views, might want to separate into multiple controllers (one per major view, or one per panel)
- Methods are void, but yes they display the data properly
- IOExceptions not handled, can be left like that
- Methods have to throw IOExceptions due to using fxml
- Code is only testable by running and checking that the data displays properly
- No tests written
- No tests written
- No tests written
- Code is not clean, repeated blocks of code
- Class usage makes sense
- Lots of unused code, methods named to incorporate Mitch's code (employee views), methods that might be used later?
- No known libraries to simplify code
- Code performs well enough
- Low time complexity
- Low space complexity
- Consistent style of code
- Style of code dissimilar to peer's code