Criteria	Points Range	Description
Source Code Functionality (40 Points)		**Code Executable**
	30-40	Excellent: Code is fully functional, meets all specified requirements, runs without errors, and demonstrates all intended features as described.
	20-29	Good: Code is mostly functional with minor errors that do not significantly affect functionality; most features work as intended.
	15-19	Satisfactory: Code is partially functional with significant errors; missing some key features but demonstrates basic functionality.
	10-14	Needs Improvement: Code has limited functionality with major errors; only a few features work as intended.
	5-9	Poor: Code is minimally functional with severe errors; does not meet most requirements; minimal features working.
	1-4	Very Poor: Code runs but does not meet requirements; minimal functionality present.
	0	No Submission or Non-Functional: No code submitted, or code does not run at all.
Application of Principles and Practices (40 Points)		**Code, comments, and structure**
	30-40	Excellent: Thorough application of all software engineering principles and best practices taught; clean code, comments, modularity structure, etc.
	20-29	Good: Applies most principles and practices with minor omissions; overall code, comments, and structure quality is good with few inconsistencies.
	15-19	Satisfactory: Applies some principles and practices but with notable omissions; some code, comments, and/or structure issues and inconsistencies present.
	10-14	Needs Improvement: Few principles and practices applied; many code, comments, and/or structure quality issues; poor organization and inconsistent coding and/or comments.
	5-9	Poor: Minimal application of principles; code, comments, and/or structure are difficult to read and understand; lacks structure.
	1-4	Very Poor: Very little application of principles; major code, comments, and/or structure quality issues; almost unreadable.
	0	No Submission or Inadequate: No code submitted or does not follow any software engineering principles.

License Inclusion (10 Points)

License

9-10	Excellent: License included, correctly formatted, appropriate for the project, and includes first and last names of all team members.
7-8	Good: License included with minor issues (e.g., slight formatting errors, minor missing information).
5-6	Satisfactory: License included but with significant issues (e.g., incorrect license type, missing team member names).
3-4	Needs Improvement: License included but incorrect or incomplete (e.g., invalid license, missing essential information).
1-2	Poor: License included but largely incorrect or inappropriate for the project.
0	No Submission: No license included.

UCCS TA software prototype read-me file (10 Points)

TA read-me file (.pdf format)

9-10	Excellent: Documentation is comprehensive, clear, and well-organized; provides detailed instructions for TA to install, execute, and use the software prototype on UCCS IT systems.
7-8	Good: Documentation provides most necessary information with minor omissions or unclear instructions.
5-6	Satisfactory: Documentation is adequate but has notable omissions or unclear sections; some steps are missing or lack detail.
3-4	Needs Improvement: Documentation is incomplete or difficult to follow; lacks important information needed to install and run the software.
1-4	Poor: Documentation is minimal; provides very little useful information.
0	No Submission: No user documentation provided.

Bonus for open-source (2 Points)

2	**2% on the semester project CODE grade if a proper open-source is included and the code is publicly available (e.g., on GitHub)**