

Name:

ICS4U – Assignment: Algorithm Efficiency

Expectations & Achievement Categories	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Software solution meets defined requirements; all test cases execute successfully (Application)	<p>The program exceeds the requirements in the specification.</p> <p>All test cases pass.</p>	<p>The program meets the requirements in the specification.</p> <p>Almost all test cases pass</p>	<p>The program meets most of the requirements in the specification.</p> <p>Some test cases pass.</p>	<p>The program does not meet several of the requirements in the specification.</p> <p>There are several errors.</p>
Source code well designed using a modular design. (Application)	<p>Methods are highly cohesive and designed for reusability.</p> <p>No unnecessary duplication of algorithms and/or data structures.</p>	<p>Some methods are used, but more should be defined.</p> <p>Minimal duplication of algorithms and/or data structures.</p>	<p>Few methods are used.</p> <p>Some duplication of algorithms and/or data structures.</p>	<p>Program does not use methods effectively.</p> <p>Significant duplication of algorithms and/or data structures.</p>
Source code written in a readable manner using industry standards (Communication)	<p>Code is very well organised and very easy to understand.</p> <p>Formatting conventions are always followed; naming conventions are consistent.</p>	<p>The code is organised and easy to understand.</p> <p>Formatting conventions are mostly followed; naming conventions are mostly consistent</p>	<p>The code is somewhat organised and understandable.</p> <p>Formatting and/or naming conventions is/are sometimes inconsistent.</p>	<p>The code is not well-organised and is not easy to understand.</p> <p>Unconventional/inconsistent formatting or naming make code less clear/readable.</p>
Source code has internal documentation (Communication)	<p>Thorough internal documentation is provided, and it clearly explains the design.</p>	<p>Internal documentation provided but could be clearer.</p>	<p>Insufficient or confusing internal documentation.</p>	<p>Minimal/no internal documentation.</p>
Plots of list length vs. execution time for each algorithm (Communication)	<p>Consistent style used for all plots and very clean aesthetic.</p> <p>All plots are very readable, very clearly labeled; appropriate scale</p> <p>Trendline accurately fits the data</p>	<p>Consistent style used for all plots;</p> <p>Plots are readable, labeled; scale is ok</p> <p>Trendline included for each plot, but could be better fit</p>	<p>Plot styles are mostly consistent.</p> <p>Plots are fairly readable; scale is too big/small/distorts impression</p> <p>Trendline included for each plot, but not an appropriate fit</p>	<p>Plot styles are inconsistent.</p> <p>Plots are not easily readable; scale is not at all appropriate to convey results clearly</p> <p>Trendline not included for all plots; trendlines not at all suitable to application</p>

Comments:

