|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program 1** | |  |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Insufficient (0 pts)** | **Needs Development**  **(1-2 pts)** | **Sufficient (3-4 pts)** | **Excellent (5 pts)** | **Marks** |
| **Pseudocode** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | A comprehensive effort was made to plan out the program using pseudocode. |  |
| **Input / Output** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions.  Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement.  A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists.  A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | All:   * The three user input values can be successfully captured through descriptive prompts |  |
| * The four output lines are well-formatted and contain all the expected information. * Output amounts displayed using proper currency formatting (e.g., preceded by a $ symbol, two decimal places) |
| **Variables & Data Types** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Solution displays a strong understanding of variable usage. All data is stored using correct data types and cast to other data types when required. |  |
| **Total Cost** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Total cost amount is correctly calculated and output to the console. Any input produces the correct output amount. |  |
| **Comments & Best Coding Practices**  (At least 60% of the functional requirements must be complete) | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Organizational or explanatory comments are used extensively, most are meaningful and easily understood. A consistent naming convention was used for most of the program and deviated very little. Source code was clean, consistently well-formatted and easy to read |  |
| **Commit messages** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Organizational or explanatory comments are used extensively, most are meaningful and easily understood. A consistent naming convention was used for most of the program and deviated very little. Source code was clean, consistently well-formatted and easy to read |  |
|  |  |  |  | **Total:** | **/30** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program 2** | | |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Insufficient (0 pts)** | **Needs Development**  **(1-2 pts)** | **Sufficient (3-4 pts)** | **Excellent (5 pts)** | **Marks** |
| **Pseudocode** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | A comprehensive effort was made to plan out the program using pseudocode. |  |
| **Input / Output** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement.  A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists.  A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | All:   * The three user input values can be successfully captured through descriptive prompts. * The single output line is well-formatted and contains all the expected information. * Output amount displays using proper currency formatting (e.g., preceded by a $ symbol, two decimal places) |  |
| **Variables & Data Types** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | Solution displays little to no understanding of variable usage.  Data rarely used or stored in correct data type. | Solution displays some understanding of variable usage.  Most data are stored using correct data types or some errors in casting exist | Solution displays a strong understanding of variable usage.  All data is stored using correct data types and cast to other data types when required. |  |
| **Weekly Payment** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | The weekly payment amount is correctly calculated based on variable values. |  |
| **Comments & Best Coding Practices**  (At least 60% of the functional requirements must be complete) | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Organizational or explanatory comments are used extensively, most are meaningful and easily understood.  A consistent naming convention was used for most of the program and deviated very little.  Source code was clean, consistently well-formatted and easy to read |  |
| **Commit messages** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Organizational or explanatory comments are used extensively, most are meaningful and easily understood. A consistent naming convention was used for most of the program and deviated very little. Source code was clean, consistently well-formatted and easy to read |  |
|  |  |  |  | **Total:** | **/30** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Program 3** | | | |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Insufficient (0 pts)** | **Needs Development**  **(1-2 pts)** | **Sufficient (3-4 pts)** | **Excellent (5 pts)** | **Marks** |
| **Pseudocode** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | A comprehensive effort was made to plan out the program using pseudocode. |  |
| **Input / Output** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Both of:   * The four user input values can be successfully captured through descriptive prompts. * The single output line contains all expected information and is formatted as shown. |  |
| **Variables & Data Types** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Solution displays a strong understanding of variable usage.  All data is stored using correct data types and cast to other data types when required. |  |
| **Conversion to Metric** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Conversion to metric is correctly calculated based on variable values. |  |
| **Comments & Best Coding Practices**  (At least 60% of the functional requirements must be complete) | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Organizational or explanatory comments are used extensively, most are meaningful and easily understood.  A consistent naming convention was used for most of the program and deviated very little.  Source code was clean, consistently well-formatted and easy to read |  |
| **Commit messages** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | Organizational or explanatory comments are used extensively, most are meaningful and easily understood. A consistent naming convention was used for most of the program and deviated very little. Source code was clean, consistently well-formatted and easy to read |  |
|  |  |  |  | **Total:** | **/30** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GitHub Repository** | | | |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Insufficient (0 pts)** | **Needs Development**  **(1-4 pts)** | **Sufficient (5-9 pts)** | **Excellent (10 pts)** | **Marks** |
| **Continuous Integration** | Little to no effort was made or contains too many errors / omissions. | A reasonable effort was made, but there are multiple areas for improvement. | A good effort was made, but at least one error or omission exists. | A comprehensive effort was made to adopt continuous integration (Build, Test, Merge) during the project development, frequently committing code to your shared repository. |  |
|  |  |  |  | **Total:** | **/10** |

Assignment 1 Total: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ / 100