

## Go Code Colorado – Code Evaluation Rubric

<b>Functionality (40% of total score)</b>	Score
The code is completely functional and responds correctly producing the correct outputs and or responses under all functional tests.	4
The program is mostly functional and responds correctly producing the correct outputs and or responses under most functional tests. There are minor problems with the program implementation.	3
The code is marginally functional with numerous errors. The code may respond correctly under certain circumstances, but there are significant errors and/or incomplete code sections.	2
The code is minimally functional with significant portions of the code missing or incomplete. The code is largely non-responsive to most functional tests and/or inputs.	1
The code is not functional, meeting no significant design specifications, or was not attempted.	0

<b>Logical Structure (20% of total score)</b>	Score
The code is extremely well organized, properly formatted, and easy to follow. Related code sections are logically grouped.	4
The code is reasonably easy to follow with logical groupings of related code. There are minor formatting problems.	3
The code is readable only with significant effort. There is little to no formatting and/or significant problems with code organization.	2
The code is poorly organized and difficult to read. There is little to no consistency in formatting and logical code grouping.	1
The code is readable only by the author or someone extremely knowledgeable with its layout and purpose.	0

<b>Sustainability (20% of total score)</b>	Score
The code is extremely well documented. Comments are completely consistent with the associated code. There are no grammar or spelling errors.	4
The code is reasonably well documented. There are minor formatting omissions that would have improved user understanding of code purpose. There may be limited grammar or spelling errors.	3
The code is marginally documented. There are significant portions of the code that are not documented or documented incorrectly. There are a significant number of spelling and/or grammar errors that detract from the documentation.	2
The code is poorly documented. There are minimal comments and/or the comments are incorrect.	1
The code is not documented.	0

<b>User Experience (10% of total score)</b>	Score
The app has no working defects, is interactive, user friendly and clearly is designed to accommodate future features.	4
The app is built to a working product standard, can be navigated, has all features available, but has minor bugs.	3
The app is built to a working product standard, is not easily navigated and has many bugs and/or is missing key features.	2
The app is not up to a working product standard, difficult to navigate, and the design makes it difficult to add features.	1
The app is not functioning and/or available on any test or live server or app store.	0

<b>Security (10% of total score)</b>	Score
Dual authentication mechanisms. SSL and data encryption. Payment processing solution is PCI DSS compliant.	4
Sufficient authentication mechanism, role-based access control, multi-level permission schemes, audit logging, credentials not cached.	3
Exposed to some common vulnerabilities <sup>1</sup> that risk breach of sensitive or confidential (PII) information (e.g., SQL injection, application calls to OS through command shells).	2
Authentication mechanism without adequate protections (e.g., clear text passwords).	1
Needed security mechanisms completely absent.	0

\*Apps not requiring security will be graded on a 90% scale. All other categories are required.

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.owasp.org/images/0/08/OWASP\\_SCP\\_Quick\\_Reference\\_Guide\\_v2.pdf](https://www.owasp.org/images/0/08/OWASP_SCP_Quick_Reference_Guide_v2.pdf)