Daily Report – Python

General Report Info

Field	Description
Date	July 01, 2025
Internship Track	Python
Team Lead	**Mobeen Sarwar** - Ali Shafique - Abdullah Amjad
Day	Day 6

Daily Summary (Team-Wise)

Category	Remarks
Overall Attendance	24 out of 30 interns joined today's session
Response & Activeness	Noticeable drop in attendance, possibly due to mid-week slowdown. However, the active participants engaged well with the task. Scrimba discussion was minimal; more support queries were handled in Discord.
Common Questions Asked	◆ Grade range boundaries and how to structure if-elif-else ◆ Named arguments usage in function calls ◆ Validating score input edge cases ◆ Clarification on task deadline and submission format
Issue Resolution	◆ Shared code snippets on how to use elif chains effectively ◆ Clarified grade boundaries and default function arguments ◆ Example of formatted output shared again for reference ◆ A reminder was sent about the GitHub + LinkedIn dual submission requirement
General Observations	Participants are beginning to understand practical use of logic-based coding. Some confusion around formatted string syntax and validation logic was observed, but resolved through examples and group interaction. The shared PPT helped clear up structure and expectations.
Suggested Improvements	Interns should: ◆ Maintain attendance and submit tasks within the stated timeline ◆ Ask logic-based questions early to avoid deadline stress ◆ Regularly update LinkedIn to reflect consistent participation ◆ Ensure GitHub repositories are organized and correctly named for tracking ◆ Practice boolean logic independently to build stronger foundation for upcoming modules

Individual Intern Tracking

No.	Name	Present	Task Done	LinkedIn Log	GitHub Quality	LinkedIn Quality	Queries Asked	Notes	Grade (10)
1	Aliza Nawaz	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	❌ Not Found	⚠️ Submitted via DOC	❌ Not Posted	✅ Yes	Submitted via Word due to GitHub confusion. Code logic is correct and covers requirements.	**8.2**
2	Bushra Khalid	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	❌ Not Found	✅ Functional & Clear	❌ Not Submitted	❌ No	Code demonstrates clear logic for tuples and sets, with good use of input and comments.	**8.5**
3	Zubia Tanoli	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Clean, lacks edge checks	✅ Clear and well-formatted	❌ No	Code fulfills requirements. Good explanation on LinkedIn. Could improve input handling.	**9.3**
4	Alishba Malik	⚠️ Late Join	❌ No	❌ No	❌ Not Submitted	❌ Not Submitted	✅ Yes	Reached out after phone issue; newly rejoined and catching up.	**6.0**
5	Hira Malik	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Functional Logic	⚠️ Very Minimal	❌ No	Completed basic task. Code runs correctly, but minimal explanation or reflection.	**8.5**
6	Rafia Bibi	❌ Not Confirmed	❌ No	❌ No	❌ No Submission	❌ No Submission	✅ Yes	Did not submit due to internet outage and being away from home. Communicated reason.	**6.0**
7	Ali Hashir	❌ Not Confirmed	❌ No	❌ No	❌ No Submission	❌ No Submission	❌ No	Did not submit task. Had previously cited communication/internet issues during interview.	**5.5**

8	Sami Ullah Khan	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Correct & Functional	✅ Basic but Sincere	❌ No	Completed task with clean, valid code. Good grasp of tuple/set usage. Could enhance formatting.	**8.8**
9	Saad Khan	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Clear & Functional	✅ Concise & Engaging	❌ No	Code meets all task requirements with dynamic set operations. Strong understanding shown.	**9.6**
10	Hashir Sakim Dad	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Clean & Modular	✅ Reflective & Technical	❌ No	Code structure is well-commented and follows clean formatting. Demonstrated clear understanding.	**9.7**
11	Tayyab Bashir	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Clear & Functional	✅ Precise & Structured	❌ No	Task completed with solid logic. Good clarity in code and post was brief but focused.	**9.4**
12	Haider Masood	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Structured & Modular	✅ Brief but Aligned	❌ No	Functional use of tuples/sets with proper modularization through functions. Good exception handling.	**9.5**
13	Kashaf Qureshi	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Yes	✅ Modular & Readable	✅ Clear & Contextual	❌ No	Code is neatly structured using tuples/sets. Handled edge cases. LinkedIn post reflects learning.	**9.6**

Direct Communication Log

No.	Name	Was Contacted	Message Topics	Replied?	Response Summary	Follow-up Needed
1	Aliza Nawaz	✅ Yes	GitHub issue, task submission help	✅ Yes	Submitted task via DOC format; promised to resolve GitHub use	✅ Yes (GitHub setup check)
2	Bushra Khalid	❌ No	—	❌ No	No communication, task submitted directly	✅ Yes (Submit LinkedIn log)
3	Zubia Tanoli	❌ No	—	❌ No	No direct interaction required	❌ No
4	Alishba Malik	✅ Yes	Phone damage, late participation	✅ Yes	Reported valid issue, joined late, committed to catch up	✅ Yes (task follow-up)
5	Hira Malik	❌ No	—	❌ No	No interaction recorded; silent but compliant	✅ Optional (richer posts)
6	Rafia Bibi	✅ Yes	Task submission, availability	✅ Yes	Informed she was out and had internet issues	✅ Yes (catch-up support)
7	Ali Hashir	❌ No	—	❌ No	No updates received. Likely tech issues persist	✅ Yes (gentle check-in)
8	Sami Ullah Khan	❌ No	—	❌ No	No queries raised; task delivered correctly	❌ No
9	Saad Khan	❌ No	—	❌ No	Worked independently and submitted everything on time	❌ No
10	Hashir Sakim Dad	❌ No	—	❌ No	Task submitted on time, no interaction needed	❌ No
11	Tayyab Bashir	❌ No	—	❌ No	Completed task independently and on time	❌ No
12	Haider Masood	❌ No	—	❌ No	Task was submitted on time, no queries made	❌ No
13	Kashaf Qureshi	❌ No	—	❌ No	Completed task accurately without confusion	❌ No