Q2 Functionality

50 points

1 **+10.0**

User can add incomes and expenses.

2 **+5.0**

User can see all incomes and expenses.

3 **+5.0**

User can edit incomes/expenses.

4 **+5.0**

User can view their total incomes and expenses.

5 **+5.0**

User can add a goal.

6 **+5.0**

User can view progress towards their goal.

7 **+5.0**

User can edit/delete their goal.

▸ 8 Validation

Q3 Accessibility

20 points

⚙ Select one ✖

⠿ ▾1   Alt text / Decorative images

⠿ **+5.0**

All images have good alt text descriptions. Any decorative images are correctly tagged for screen readers.

⠿ **+2.5**

All images have some sort of alt text provided, although this may be insufficient.

⠿ **+0.0**

No use of alt text, or alt text left blank.

⌐+ **Add Rubric Item to Group**

⚙ Select many ✖

⠿ ▾2   Use of Colour / Contrast

⠿ **+5.0**

Appropriate colours have been chosen to ensure that the website is usable for colour blind users. Colour is not the sole way of conveying meaning to the user. There is a high level of contrast behind all text.

⠿ **+2.5**

Appropriate colours have been chosen to ensure that the website is usable for colour blind users. There is generally a good level of contrast, although in places this may be lacking.

⠿ **+0.0**

The site is not usable for people with colour blindness, or there is very poor contrast in many places in the site.

⌐+ **Add Rubric Item to Group**

⠿ ▾3 Keyboard navigation

⠿ **+5.0**

The website can be easily navigated using the keyboard alone, with ARIA tags used to make this easier.

⠿ **+2.5**

It is possible to use the keyboard alone to access most of the site.

⠿ **+0.0**

It is not possible to navigate the site using the keyboard alone.

⌐+ **Add Rubric Item to Group**

⠿ ▾4 HTML

⠿ **+5.0**

The site is written using valid HTML, with language and all elements such as form fields tagged correctly in the code to ensure that assistive technology can be used.

⠿ **+2.5**

The site is generally valid, although there may be some places where fields or language have not been tagged.

⠿ **+0.0**

The HTML used is invalid, lacking proper tagging of language and elements.

⌐+ **Add Rubric Item to Group**

Q4 Design and Layout

20 points

⚙ Select many ✕

▦ [▾1] Layout & Navigation

▦ **+10.0**

The layout is consistent and professional looking throughout the site, including an appropriate way of navigating the site.

▦ **+7.0**

The layout is consistent and reasonably professional. There is a consistent way of navigating the site in which the links do not move if you change page.

▦ **+4.0**

The layout is extremely basic, and lacks a consistent method of navigating the site.

▦ **+0.0**

There has been no attempt to implement a layout for the site. Navigation uses plain links.

↳**+ Add Rubric Item to Group**

⠿ [▾2] Design

⠿ **+10.0**

The site looks good and there has clearly been a lot of thought and effort put into designing the site.

⠿ **+7.0**

The site is suitable and some effort has been put into making it look professional.

⠿ **+4.0**

There has been an effort to add some styling to the website.

⠿ **+0.0**

The website has no styling used.

⌐+ **Add Rubric Item to Group**

Q5 Quality of Code

10 points

1 +10.0

All Python code meets PEP8 standard. There are comments provided when needed, but not excessively. The code is readable and easy to follow, with no excessively long lines and a consistent format.

2 +7.0

There are fewer than 5 PEP8 errors in the code. There are some comments used in the code. The code is generally readable although there may be some issues such as long lines or inconsistent formatting.

3 +4.0

There are fewer than 20 PEP8 errors in the code. There has been an attempt to make the code more readable by adding comments.

4 +0.0

The code has many PEP8 errors and there has been no attempt to make code readable.

+ Add Rubric Item   📁 Create Group   ⬇ Import...