

Name:

## ICS4U – Assignment 2: Class Battle

| <b>Expectations &amp; Achievement Categories</b>   | <b>Level 4</b>  | <b>Level 3</b>   | <b>Level 2</b>   | <b>Level 1</b>  |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Software solution meets defined requirements; all test cases execute successfully (Application)</b> | <p>The program exceeds the requirements in the specification.</p> <p>All test cases pass.</p>   | <p>The program meets the requirements in the specification.</p> <p>Almost all test cases pass</p>  | <p>The program meets most of the requirements in the specification.</p> <p>Some test cases pass.</p>                                 | <p>The program does not meet several of the requirements in the specification.</p> <p>There are several errors.</p>   |
| <b>Source code well designed using a modular design. (Application)</b>                                 | <p>Methods are highly cohesive and designed for reusability.</p> <p>No unnecessary duplication of algorithms and/or data structures.</p>                    | <p>Some methods are used, but more should be defined.</p> <p>Minimal duplication of algorithms and/or data structures.</p>                       | <p>Few methods are used.</p> <p>Some duplication of algorithms and/or data structures.</p>   | <p>Program does not use methods effectively.</p> <p>Significant duplication of algorithms and/or data structures.</p>                                       |
| <b>Source code written in a readable manner using industry standards (Communication)</b>               | <p>Code is very well organised and very easy to understand.</p> <p>Formatting conventions are always followed; naming conventions are consistent.</p>       | <p>The code is organised and easy to understand.</p> <p>Formatting conventions are mostly followed; naming conventions are mostly consistent</p> | <p>The code is somewhat organised and understandable.</p> <p>Formatting and/or naming conventions is/are sometimes inconsistent.</p> | <p>The code is not well-organised and is not easy to understand.</p> <p>Unconventional/inconsistent formatting or naming make code less clear/readable.</p> |
| <b>Source code has internal documentation (Communication)</b>  | <p>Thorough internal documentation is provided, and it clearly explains the design.</p> <p>Very clear docstrings included for functions/classes/methods</p> | <p>Internal documentation provided but could be clearer.</p> <p>Docstrings included for functions/classes/methods</p>                            | <p>Insufficient or confusing internal documentation.</p> <p>Some docstrings included, some docstrings unclear.</p>                   | <p>Minimal/no internal documentation.</p> <p>Minimal/no docstrings included.</p>  |

## Comments:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Software solution meets defined requirements; all test cases execute successfully</b> |  |
| <b>Source code well designed using a modular design.</b>                                 |  |
| <b>Source code written in a readable manner using industry standards</b>                 |  |
| <b>Source code has internal documentation</b>  |  |
| <b>Next steps:</b>   | For all subsequent assignments, user input should be fully validated |

%