

A3Q4	Level 4				Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
	Level 3				Level 2		Level 1		Level 0	
communication	Nothing assumed, catching errors, anticipating users needs - beyond Level 3				Comments - useful succinct, (block OK), not sparse, block at top (modifications, start date, programmer name, problem description, Notes on anything special or unusual, citations)		lacking explanation, inline comments, or hard to read, or spelling mistakes on output or Programmer missing or modifications		Any two or more details missing or Citations/borrowed work not acknowledged OR more than 25% of code borrowed	
	Excellent				Readability - code is easy to follow, enough white space		Adequate		Needs improvement	
	User instructions that are clear and can be accessed at any time or Additional options, like premature quit.				user interface, clear language, no grammar or spelling errors		2 or 3 grammar or spelling errors		User interface not clear, poor language and or spelling and grammar errors	
	With open or similar more advanced coding - not required or not taken in class OR new or better implementation of class work				Proper class usages and storing of data		Considerable usages and storing of data, few minor errors		hard coded words and forgot to close files	
Knowledge Thinking & inquiry	Description at top to clarify				IPO - proper chart (headings), steps, proper terminology		Unclear steps or incorrect terminology		missing information in columns or steps missing	
Thinking & inquiry	Screen sizes to user systems. Make it interactive. Colour or design helps user know what stage they are at.				Graphics are appropriate and professional looking for <sup>21</sup> word list appropriate components - Standard screen size 1280 x 1024		Small graphics, features not intuitive.		No graphics, just console that user would not necessarily have. Lost count on number of guesses.	
					Trace statements - variable name, steps and changes (Table/chart)		Variable names don't match or missed a step		more confusing, complicate the existing error, or do not recognize it.	
					All functions (including user) are efficient and work as expected		Functions work, but confusing or inefficient		Hard coded where a user defined function or built in would suffice	
Application	Could be class based Highly efficient, best possible, perhaps found a new function or way to complete the task				Code efficiency - nested if's better into function or class.		Nested if's or lack of proper loops - does not take advantage of built in functions		No functions or classes	
Flowchart/IPO/Tr Table application)	colouring to add to understanding, input one colour/output another				Flowchart - organized, proper spacing, correct symbols, proper language		Poor spacing, some incorrect symbols, typing errors,		poor organizations, many symbols used incorrectly for the concept attempting to convey, arrows in the wrong section or incorrect pointer.	

calls + uses Orig Class ✓ - IF Calls own class - (no 4 orig. in your class) = 100% ?  
 No, a Orig. class used = 10%. Runs well.