Solution design (levels-based mark scheme)

| | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | Max. |
|------------------------|--------|---|---|---|--|---|---|------|
| | | • | There has been little attempt to decompose the problem. | • | There has been some attempt to decompose the problem. | • | The problem has been decomposed clearly into component parts. | 3 |
| No rewardable material | terial | • | Some of the component parts of the problem can be seen in the solution, although this will not be | • | Most of the component parts of the problem can be seen in the solution. | • | The component parts of the problem can be seen clearly in the solution. | |
| | | • | complete. Some parts of the logic are clear | • | Most parts of the logic are clear and appropriate to the problem. | • | The logic is clear and appropriate to the problem. | |
| | dab | | and appropriate to the problem. | • | The use of variables and data | • | The choice of variables and data | |
| | varı | • | The use of variables and data structures, appropriate to the | | structures is mostly appropriate. | | structures is appropriate to the problem. | |
| | | | problem, is limited. | | The choice of programming constructs is mostly appropriate to the problem. | • | The choice of programming | |
| | Nc | • | The choice of programming constructs, appropriate to the problem, is limited. | | | | constructs is accurate and appropriate to the problem. | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Functionality (levels-based mark scheme)

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Max. |
|------------------------|--|--|--|------|
| | Functionality (when the code is run) | Functionality (when the code is run) | Functionality (when the code is run) | 3 |
| No rewardable material | The component parts of the program are incorrect or incomplete, providing a program of limited functionality that meets some of the given requirements. Program outputs are of limited accuracy and/or provide limited information. Program responds predictably to some of the anticipated input. Solution is not robust and may crash on anticipated or provided input. | The component parts of the program are complete, providing a functional program that meets most of the stated requirements. Program outputs are mostly accurate and informative. Program responds predictably to most of the anticipated input. Solution may not be robust within the constraints of the problem. | The component parts of the program are complete, providing a functional program that fully meets the given requirements. Program outputs are accurate, informative, and suitable for the user. Program responds predictably to anticipated input. Solution is robust within the constraints of the problem. | |

Functionality (levels-based mark scheme)

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Max. |
|------------------------|--|--|--|------|
| | Functionality (when the code is run) | Functionality (when the code is run) | Functionality (when the code is run) | 3 |
| No rewardable material | The component parts of the program are incorrect or incomplete, providing a program of limited functionality that meets some of the given requirements. Program outputs are of limited accuracy and/or provide limited information. Program responds predictably to some of the anticipated input. Solution is not robust and may crash on anticipated or provided input. | The component parts of the program are complete, providing a functional program that meets most of the stated requirements. Program outputs are mostly accurate and informative. Program responds predictably to most of the anticipated input. Solution may not be robust within the constraints of the problem. | The component parts of the program are complete, providing a functional program that fully meets the given requirements. Program outputs are accurate, informative, and suitable for the user. Program responds predictably to anticipated input. Solution is robust within the constraints of the problem. | |

Solution design (levels-based mark scheme)

| 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | Max. | |
|------------|---|--|---|---|--------|---|---|--|
| | • | There has been little attempt to decompose the problem. | • | There has been some attempt to decompose the problem. | • | The problem has been decomposed clearly into component parts. | 3 | |
| material | • | Some of the component parts of the problem can be seen in the solution, although this will not be complete. Some parts of the logic are clear | • | Most of the component parts of the problem can be seen in the solution. | • | The component parts of the problem can be seen clearly in the solution. | | |
| _ | • | | • | Most parts of the logic are clear and appropriate to the problem. | • | The logic is clear and appropriate to the problem. | | |
| dabı | | and appropriate to the problem. | The use of variables and data structures is mostly appropriate. The choice of programming constructs is mostly appropriate to the problem. | | • | The choice of variables and data | | |
| rewardable | • | The use of variables and data structures, appropriate to the | | | , ,, , | | structures is appropriate to the problem. | |
| _ | | problem, is limited. | | The choice of programming | | | | |
| No | • | The choice of programming constructs, appropriate to the problem, is limited. | | the problem. | | constructs is accurate and appropriate to the problem. | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Good programming practices (levels-based mark scheme)

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Max. |
|------------------------|---|---|--|------|
| No rewardable material | There has been little attempt to lay out the code into identifiable sections to aid readability. Some use of meaningful variable names. Limited or excessive commenting. Parts of the code are clear, with limited use of appropriate spacing and indentation. | There has been some attempt to lay out the code to aid readability, although sections may still be mixed. Uses mostly meaningful variable names. Some use of appropriate commenting, although may be excessive. Code is mostly clear, with some use of appropriate white space to aid readability. | Layout of code is effective in separating sections, e.g. putting all variables together, putting all subprograms together as appropriate. Meaningful variable names and subprogram interfaces are used where appropriate. Effective commenting is used to explain logic of code blocks. Code is clear, with good use of white space to aid readability. | 3 |

Functionality (levels-based mark scheme)

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Max. |
|------------------------|--|--|--|------|
| | Functionality (when the code is run) | Functionality (when the code is run) | Functionality (when the code is run) | 3 |
| No rewardable material | The component parts of the program are incorrect or incomplete, providing a program of limited functionality that meets some of the given requirements. Program outputs are of limited accuracy and/or provide limited information. Program responds predictably to some of the anticipated input. Solution is not robust and may crash on anticipated or provided input. | The component parts of the program are complete, providing a functional program that meets most of the stated requirements. Program outputs are mostly accurate and informative. Program responds predictably to most of the anticipated input. Solution may not be robust within the constraints of the problem. | The component parts of the program are complete, providing a functional program that fully meets the given requirements. Program outputs are accurate, informative, and suitable for the user. Program responds predictably to anticipated input. Solution is robust within the constraints of the problem. | |