CSC126 - FUNDAMENTALS OF ALGORITHMS & COMPUTER PROBLEM SOLVING
GROUP PROJECT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC (35%)

CLO 3: Demonstrate communication skills in tasks related to computer program solutions (PLO5, A3)

A. REPORT SCORING RUBRICS (25%)

Attribute	Sub-attribute	No Submission	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	WEIGHTAGE
		0	1	2	3	4	
PROPOSAL REPORT	Requirements of Proposal	No Submission	No objective and analysis	Fairly complete and correct objectives and analysis	Good, complete and correct objectives and analysis	Good, creative, complete and correct objectives and analysis	**2**
FINAL REPORT	Report Format	No Submission	Report lacks a proper cover page or includes incorrect information. Font type/size is inconsistent or unprofessional. Spacing and alignment are uneven and distracting. Formatting does not follow any standard.	Report includes a basic cover page but may miss some required details. Font and spacing are mostly consistent but with some errors. Alignment issues are present but do not severely hinder readability.	Report includes a clear cover page with all required details. Font size and type are mostly consistent. Spacing and alignment are proper with only minor formatting issues. Layout is neat and readable.	Report is professionally formatted. Cover page is complete and follows prescribed format. Consistent use of appropriate font type/size, proper line spacing, justified alignment, and clean sectioning enhance readability. Fully adheres to formatting guidelines.	1
	Introduction	No Submission	Poor introduction. The problem-to-solve is not well introduced.	Fairly good introduction. The problem-to-solve is introduced.	Good introduction. The problem-to-solve is well introduced.	A very good introduction. The problem-to-solve is well introduced with supporting references.	1
	Algorithm	No Submission	The flowcharts and pseudocodes are incomplete and incorrect, and they do not accurately reflect the developed program.	Fairly complete and correct flow chart and pseudocodes, based on the program developed.	Good, complete and correct flow chart and pseudocodes based on the program developed.	Good, creative, complete and correct flowchart and pseudocodes based on the program developed.	1
	Discussion & Conclusion	No Submission	Unrelated discussion and conclusion	Fairly good discussion and conclusion	Good and logical discussion and conclusion	Well thought-out and logical discussion and conclusion.	1
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	Variables	No Submission	Poor use of variables. Poor naming conventions.	Fair use of variables. Fair naming conventions.	Good use of variables. Good naming conventions.	Excellent use of variables. Excellent naming conventions.	1
	Documentation & Readability	No Submission	The program is poorly organized, does not contain comments and is very difficult to read. Poor use of whitespace and indentation.	The program is readable only by someone who knows what it is supposed to be doing, and has very few comments. White space and indentation makes the program fairly easy to read.	The program is fairly easy to read. A fair amount of comments are included. Good use of white space and indentation.	The program is exceptionally well-organized, well-commented and very easy to follow and easily readable. Excellent use of white space and indentation.	1
	Requirements of project	No Submission	Fails to meet core requirements. Lacks proper use of selection, repetition, functions, or arrays.	Addresses only basic requirements. Includes one or two elements (e.g., only selection and functions), with limited logic or incomplete implementation.	Meets most project requirements. Includes at least three out of four of the following: selection, repetition, functions, arrays.	Fully satisfies all project requirements. Include selection control structure, repetition control structure, function and array.	1
	Efficiency	No Submission	A difficult and inefficient solution.	A logical solution, easy to follow but not the most efficient.	The solution is fairly efficient and easy to follow (i.e. no confusing tricks).	The solution is extremely efficient, easy to understand and maintain.	1
	Code Execution (logic error/runtime error/syntax error)	No Submission	The program does not compile, or errors occur.	The program mostly works, but the program functions incorrectly on some inputs.	The program works in the way the student intended.	The program is functional and refined, with extra features that exceed the requirements.	1
	Input & Output	No Submission	Prompts unclear or absent.	User prompts contain little information, poor design.	User prompts are understandable, minimum use of symbols or spacing in output.	Excellent user prompts, and good use of symbols or spacing in output (neatly displayed).	1
	Originality	No Submission	The program is copied with little to no personal contribution. There is no evidence of unique ideas or problem-solving.	The program mostly follows existing examples or tutorials, with few changes. The student shows limited original input.	The program includes personal touches or modifications to existing ideas. The student has adapted examples in a meaningful way.	The program shows unique ideas and creative solutions. The student's work is clearly their own, with little to no copying.	2
	Creativity & Complexity	No Submission	The program is largely copied or reused with minimal changes. Uses very basic constructs (e.g., only main() function, no arrays or modularization). No evidence of functions or structured logic.	The program uses basic functions and simple 1D arrays. May include a few user-defined functions with minimal logic. Does not attempt use of 2D arrays or different parameter types. Logic is mostly linear.	The program uses multiple user-defined functions (with at least 1–2 parameters). Employs both 1D arrays and some modular design. Demonstrates understanding of parameter passing by value. May include an attempt at using 2D arrays or multiple return types.	The program demonstrates high-level complexity through multiple structured functions, use of both value and reference parameters, 1D and 2D arrays, and varying return types. It shows creative problem-solving with modularity and logic beyond basic requirements. Clear effort is made to design a flexible, reusable, and scalable program structure.	2

B. SCORING RUBRICS - INDIVIDUAL (10%)

Attribute	Sub-attribute	No Submission	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	WEIGHTAGE
		0	1	2	3	4	
PRESENTATION	Presentation skills (Communicative ability)	No Presentation	The student is not able to present confidently and articulate. Minimal eye contact. The audience was not engaged. Inappropriate/ disinterested body language.	The student is able to present with limited confidence and effect and requires further improvements. The student focused on only part of the audience. The audience was distracted. Body language was distracting.	The student is able to present confidently, effectively, and articulately Steady eye contact. The audience was engaged by the presentation. Some fidgeting by the student.	The student is able to present with great confidence, effect and articulately. Regular/constant eye contact. The audience was engaged. Appropriate body language.	3
	Length	No Presentation	Presentation was 5 minutes over specified length.	Presentation was 3 - 4 minutes over or under the specified length.	Presentation was 1 - 2 minutes over or under the specified length.	Presentation was within specified length.	1
	Clear delivery of ideas (Content)	No Presentation	Student cannot describe how their code works. The student didn't understand the project. Not able to deliver ideas clearly and requires major improvement.	Student can mostly describe how their code works. The student showed a fair understanding of some parts of the project. Able to deliver ideas fairly clearly and requires minor improvements.	Student can describe how their code works and can make changes that have the desired effects. Most of the time, the student showed a good understanding of the project. Able to deliver ideas clearly.	Student can describe how their code works and how they wrote it, and help others debug their code. The student showed complete understanding of the project. Able to deliver idea with great clarity.	2
	Understand and respond to questions	No Presentation	Not able to understand and respond to a question or the answer given is incorrect.	Fairly able to accurately answer questions.	Able to answer most of the questions.	Able to fully understand and respond to questions very well.	3