**Trimester 1, Period 2 Unit 4 Grading**

The same grade is given to every member of the team, based on what they submitted. The reason we did this was to encourage pair programming and asking teammates to fix problems and write the best code.

Scoring:

1 - Code works perfectly, but also does something special or interesting showing complete understanding of concepts.

0.9 - Code works perfectly, meeting all of the requirements.

0.8 - Code works, but there are a few mistakes (mainly typos).

0.7 - Code is dysfunctional and difficult to understand (luckily nobody got this).

| Table | Members | **Score** | Brief Reason |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Divya, Linda, Rebecca, Vaishavi | **1** | Interesting if statements |
| 2 | Riya Patil, Vidhi Kulkarni, Lily Wu, William Wu | **0.9** | Code works |
| 3 | Karthik Valluri, Sanja Bharadwaj, Evan Yang, Pranav Sarathy | **0.9** | Code works in decrypting data |
| 4 | Rohan Juneja, Kinish Sathish, Gabriel Boudreau, Jay Manjrekar | **0.8** | Code clean but could probably optimize for caps |
| 5 | Meena, Pranavi, Madhumita, Shraddha | **0.9** | Code works |
| 6 | Kurtis, Nathan, Sahil, Rohit | **0.8** | A few typos |
| 7 | Reem Ben Ishai, Akhil Nandhakumar, Saathvika Ajith, Tristan Copley | **1** | Code is good and written in an interesting way |
| 8 | Bailey Say, Andrew Meng, Nicholas Mounier, Rohan Gaikwad | N/A | N/A |
| 9 | Brian Tang, Hetvi Trivedi, Jazair Tallman, Ellen Xu | **0.8** | A few typos |
| 10 | Calissa Tyrrell, Evan Sanchez, Samuel Wang, Kian Pasokhi | **0.8** | A few typos |