CREATE

ASPECT	PERFORMANCE QUALITY			SCORE
Collaborative Program	A simple program demonstrates limited use of the programming elements.	An understandable program demonstrates competent use of the programming elements.	A complex program demonstrates strategic, creative use of the programming elements.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	Little or no evidence of the use of mathematical and logical concepts exists, or there is inappropriate use of abstractions and algorithms.	There is some evidence of the use of mathematical and logical concepts or appropriate use of abstractions and algorithms.	There is evidence of the use of mathematical and logical concepts and appropriate use of abstractions and algorithms.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The source code is unclear, incorrect, or incomplete.	The source code is mostly correct, logical, and readable.	The source code is correct, logical, and easily readable.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The video makes a weak connection between the program's purpose and its functionality.	The video makes a moderate connection between the program's purpose and its functionality.	The video makes a clear, strong connection between the program's purpose and its functionality.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The response exhibits a lack of focus and a confused description of the program's purpose.	The response articulates the purpose of the program and its connection to the area of focus.	The response effectively articulates the purpose of the program and its connection to the area of focus.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The programming language is misidentified.	The programming language is mostly identified.	The programming language is clearly and correctly identified.	
	1	**2**	**3**	

Collaborative Reflection	The explanation of how the selected code illustrates abstraction is incorrect or incomplete.	The explanation of how the selected code illustrates abstraction is mostly complete.	The explanation of how the selected code illustrates abstraction is well-supported by details.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The response refers to the algorithm but excludes an explanation of the purpose of the algorithm.	The response includes an explanation of the purpose of the algorithm, but the explanation lacks detail.	The response clearly describes the purpose of the chosen algorithm and effectively explains the purpose of the algorithm.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The response generally describes the development of the program but omits many important steps.	The response describes the important developmental steps of the program, but it includes little or no information about how problems were addressed.	The response describes the important developmental steps of the program, including details that enable the reader to fully understand the process involved in its creation.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
Individual Program	A simple program demonstrates limited use of the programming elements.	An understandable program demonstrates competent use of the programming elements.	A complex program demonstrates strategic, creative use of the programming elements.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	Little or no evidence of the use of mathematical and logical concepts exists, or there is inappropriate use of abstractions and algorithms.	There is some evidence of the use of mathematical and logical concepts or appropriate use of abstractions and algorithms.	There is evidence of the use of mathematical and logical concepts and appropriate use of abstractions and algorithms.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The source code is unclear, incorrect, or incomplete.	The source code is mostly correct, logical, and readable.	The source code is correct, logical, and easily readable.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The video makes a weak connection between the program's purpose and its functionality.	The video makes a moderate connection between the program's purpose and its functionality.	The video makes a clear, strong connection between the program's purpose and its functionality.	
	1	**2**	**3**	

Individual Reflection	The response exhibits a lack of focus and a confused description of the program's purpose.	The response articulates the purpose of the program and its connection to the area of focus.	The response effectively articulates the purpose of the program and its connection to the area of focus.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The programming language is misidentified.	The programming language is mostly identified.	The programming language is clearly and correctly identified.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The reflection indicates that the work of the partners is primarily independent, with each contributing separate portions of an artifact.	The reflection demonstrates a balance between partners in coordinating the workload to create an artifact.	The reflection demonstrates a high level of cooperation and coordination between partners in sharing the workload to create an artifact.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The response indicates that the work of the partners is primarily independent, with each contributing separate portions of an artifact.	The response demonstrates a balance between partners in coordinating the workload to create an artifact.	The response demonstrates a high level of cooperation and coordination between partners in sharing the workload to create an artifact.	
	1	**2**	**3**	
	The response demonstrates little or no exchange of feedback between partners.	The response explains that partners shared feedback. However, little attention is given either to identifying the most significant feedback that was provided or to how work was reviewed and revised.	The response describes effective sharing of significant feedback between partners, including details about how partners questioned each other and reviewed and revised their work.	
	1	**2**	**3**	