Project 1: Calendar Query

Due by 10pm ET Friday October 1

Comments

CONTENT
Could use some more description in introduction beyond questions themselves (why these questions?) as well as description of how you kept track beyond "in Google calendar" (how did enter data? What did you have to be mindful of?)

Some areas where pivot to base R makes "readability" a little more challenging (have to think a bit more about what the code is doing)

VISUALIZATIONS/TABLE
Would be interested in just summaries (like your last row) in the table rather than daily output. Are there other summaries that would be useful to share beyond the average time?

Would be useful to resize figures (currently taking up more space than necessary).

Axes in first graphic would be more useful in hours rather than minutes

Total Score: 90

Code rubric (50%)

Code	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unacceptable
Functionality (30%) 30	*25-30 points*: The code is completely functional and responds correctly producing the correct outputs.	*18-24 points*: The program is mostly functional and responds correctly producing the correct outputs in most cases. There are minor problems with the program implementation.	*11-17 points*: The code is marginally functional with numerous errors and/or incomplete code sections.	*6-10 points*: The code is minimally functional with significant portions of the code missing or incomplete.	*0-5 points*: The code is not functional, producing no correct outputs, or was not attempted.
Readability (10%) 8	*9-10 points*: The code is extremely well organized, properly formatted, and easy to follow.	*7-8 points*: The code is reasonably easy to read. There are minor formatting problems.	*5-6 points*: The code readable only with significant effort. There is little to no proper formatting.	*1-4 points*: The code is poorly organized and difficult to read. There is little to no consistency in formatting.	*0 points*: The code is readable only by the author or someone extremely knowledgeable with its layout and purpose.
Documentation (10%) 10	*9-10 points*: The code is extremely well documented. Comments are completely consistent with the associated code. There are no spelling errors.	*7-8 points*: The code is reasonably well documented. There are minor formatting omissions that would have improved users understanding of code purpose. There may be limited spelling errors.	*5-6 points*: The code is marginally documented. There are significant portions of the code that are not documented or documented incorrectly. There are significant spelling errors that detract from the documentation.	*1-4 points*: The code is poorly documented. There are minimal comments and/or the comments are incorrect.	*0 points*: The code is not documented.

Content rubric (50%)

Code	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unacceptable
Visualizations (15%) 14	*13-15 points*: The visualizations are relevant to the question(s) of interest and use effective visual cues. All graphical variable types used are well-suited for the type and scale of data they represent, and there are clear labels and legends.	*10-12 points*: The visualizations are relevant to the question(s) of interest and use effective visual cues. All graphical variable types used are well-suited for the type and scale of data they represent. Labeling and legends are not completely clear.	*7-9 points*: The visualizations are relevant to the question(s) of interest, but visual cues neither enhance nor detract from the main message. Most graphical variable types used are well-suited for the type and scale of data they represent. Labeling and legends not completely clear.	*4-6 points*: The visualizations are relevant to the question(s) of interest, but visual cues are ineffective or not utilized. Some graphical variable types used are wellsuited for the type and scale of data they represent. Unclear labeling and/or legends.	*0-3 points*: There are no visualizations, or the visualizations are not relevant to the question(s) of interest.
Table (10%) 6	*9-10 points*: The table displays summary statistics relevant to the question(s) of interest, is easy to read, has clear labels, and is nicely formatted. Significant figures are consistent and appropriate.	*7-8 points*: The table displays summary statistics relevant to the question(s) of interest and is easy to read. Some labels are not clear. Significant figures are consistent and appropriate.	*5-6 points*: The table displays summary statistics relevant to the question(s) of interest. Some labels are not clear. Some significant figures are inconsistent and/or inappropriate.	*2-4 points*: The table displays summary statistics relevant to the question(s) of interest. Labeling is absent or incorrect. Format is hard to read. Some significant figures are inconsistent and/or inappropriate.	*0-1 point*: There is no table, or the table is not relevant to the question(s) of interest.
Written summary (15%) 12	*13-15 points*: Written report is organized appropriately, and addresses all relevant questions correctly. Grammar and spelling are virtually error-free.	*10-12 points*: Written report is organized appropriately, and addresses most relevant questions correctly. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	*7-9 points*: Written report is organized appropriately, and addresses some relevant questions correctly. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	*4-6 points*: Written report is poorly organized with missing components, and few relevant questions are addressed correctly. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	*0-3 points*: Visualizations and table were not accompanied by written explanations and/or language used impedes meaning because of errors in usage.
Reflection (10%) 10	*9-10 points*: Reflection addresses all questions thoughtfully and thoroughly. Length is appropriate. Grammar and spelling are virtually error-free.	*7-8 points*: Reflection addresses most questions thoughtfully and thoroughly. Length is appropriate. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	*5-6 points*: Reflection addresses some questions thoughtfully. Length is appropriate. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	*2-4 points*: Reflection fails to address most questions. Length is much longer or much shorter than 1 page. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	*0-1 point*: No reflection is included, or does not address any questions.