

Project 1: Calendar Query

Due by 10pm ET Friday October 1

Comments

Content:

- very well-written and well-organized; good use of headings/subheadings

Visualizations/table:

- resize figures; taking up more space than needed
- good choices overall

Total Score: 96

Code rubric (50%) 50

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

Content rubric (50%) 46

Code	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unacceptable
Visualizations (15%) 13	<i>13-15 points:</i> 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.	<i>10-12 points:</i> 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.	<i>7-9 points:</i> 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.	<i>4-6 points:</i> The visualizations are relevant to the question(s) of interest, but visual cues are ineffective or not utilized. Some graphical variable types used are well-suited for the type and scale of data they represent. Unclear labeling and/or legends.	<i>0-3 points:</i> There are no visualizations, or the visualizations are not relevant to the question(s) of interest.
Table (10%) 10	<i>9-10 points:</i> 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.	<i>7-8 points:</i> 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.	<i>5-6 points:</i> 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.	<i>2-4 points:</i> 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.	<i>0-1 point:</i> There is no table, or the table is not relevant to the question(s) of interest.
Written summary (15%) 13	<i>13-15 points:</i> Written report is organized appropriately, and addresses all relevant questions correctly. Grammar and spelling are virtually error-free.	<i>10-12 points:</i> Written report is organized appropriately, and addresses most relevant questions correctly. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	<i>7-9 points:</i> Written report is organized appropriately, and addresses some relevant questions correctly. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	<i>4-6 points:</i> Written report is poorly organized with missing components, and few relevant questions are addressed correctly. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	<i>0-3 points:</i> Visualizations and table were not accompanied by written explanations and/or language used impedes meaning because of errors in usage.
Reflection (10%) 10	<i>9-10 points:</i> Reflection addresses all questions thoughtfully and thoroughly. Length is appropriate. Grammar and spelling are virtually error-free.	<i>7-8 points:</i> Reflection addresses most questions thoughtfully and thoroughly. Length is appropriate. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	<i>5-6 points:</i> Reflection addresses some questions thoughtfully. Length is appropriate. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	<i>2-4 points:</i> Reflection fails to address most questions. Length is much longer or much shorter than 1 page. There are few errors in grammar or spelling.	<i>0-1 point:</i> No reflection is included, or does not address any questions.