**Project 2 Grading Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Full Credit** | **At least 70%** | **At most 70%** | **Point Value** |
| **Does it run at all?** | Program runs cleanly, without any grader adjustment or unnecessary input | Up to one minor syntax error or unwarranted user input event | Multiple errors, persistent user activity required | **\_\_\_\_ / 10** |
| **Does it generate a correct graphical representation of the map?** | Start point, hiker, path, trees, and end point are represented | ... | Map does not accurately reflect input | **\_\_\_\_ / 20** |
| **Does it correctly navigate the map, following the rules of movement?** | No diagonal movement, no repeated path checks, movement and checks indicated clearly | Movement or direction checks are not obvious based on graphical representation | Movement disobeys rules, same path traversed multiple times | **\_\_\_\_ / 20** |
| **Input and output expectations are met** | User only needs to provide map file name and the rest takes care of itself | ... | Program fails to parse input file, gives unexpected output | **\_\_\_\_ / 15** |
| **Is it modular and adequately commented?** | Cursory overview of code is sufficient to recognize how it works | Structurally sound, but poorly commented (or vice-versa) | Unintelligible code, comments | **\_\_\_\_ / 10** |
| **Is it implemented using a stack?** | Yes | ... | No | **\_\_\_\_ / 15** |
| **Style (graphical aesthetic and quality of code)** | This will be more of an impression of the amount of energy that the student put into the project. Did they take an interest in illustrating an avatar moving around a map? Does their code reflect carefulness and attention to detail? | | | **\_\_\_\_ / 10** |
| **OVERALL** | The project description could have been written as a description of this project | This project clearly aimed to meet the description, but something(s) fell short | The submission is severely flawed, unenjoyable to interact with | **\_\_\_\_ / 100** |