MONASH University

STUDENT'S NAME:	0
ID NO:	0
UNIT CODE AND TITLE:	FIT3143 PARALLEL COMPUTING
SEM/YEAR:	2/2019
CAMPUS:	CLAYTON/MALAYSIA
ASSIGNMENT 2 - REPORT (10 MARKS)	
ASSESSOR:	0
DATE:	TIME:

PART A: ABSTRACT & INTRODUCTION

	Criteria	Marks	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Weak)	2 (Satisfactory)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)	Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)	Scaled marks	Comments
1	Abstract	1	No abstract	Weak abstract without any summary of results from the assignment and missing keywords.	Plausible description, contains a legitimate method and results, but somewhat broad with basic. Keywords included.	Abstract is well articulated with a legitimate method and clear results (e.g., actual speed up). Keywords included.	Abstract is clearly articulated with a persuasive legitimate method, original opinion and clear results. Keywords included.		0	
2	Introduction	1	No introduction	Weak introduction with an inadequate overview of the assignment objectives, concepts and hypothesis.	A basic overview of the assignment. The objectives, concepts and hypothesis of the assignment is presented albeit not clear.	An adequate overview of the assignment. The objectives of the assignment is presented. The description of Inter Process Communication is provided with citations. An hypothesis is presented which describes the method applied to implement a simulated distributed wireless sensor network as per the assignment specifications.	An **thorough** overview of the assignment. The objectives of the assignment is presented. The description of Inter Process Communication is provided with citations. An clear and concrete hypothesis is presented which describes the method applied to implement a simulated distributed wireless sensor network as per the assignment specifications.		0	
Sub-Total (2 marks)									0	

MONASH University

	PART B: THEORETICAL ANALYSIS & IPC DESIGN									
	Criteria	**Marks**	**0 (Unacceptable)**	**1 (Weak)**	**2 (Satisfactory)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Excellent)**	**Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)**	**Scaled marks**	**Comments**
1	Technical illustration and description of the IPC architecture used to simulate the distributed wireless sensor network using MPI	1	Not provided.	Weak illustration and with little or no description	Adequate illustration of the IPC grid architecture with some proper description of the illustration.	Detailed illustrations of the IPC grid architecture along with a clear description of these illustrations.	**Thorough** illustrations of IPC grid architecture along with a clear description of these illustrations. Compelling arguments are presented to justify the selected IPC architecture with comparisons to published papers in literature.		0	
2	Description of the applied encryption/decryption algorithm with OpenMP	1	Not provided.	Weak description with obvious discrepancies. No proper citations to the applied method.	Adequate description using some basic encryption/descryption algorithm.	Good description using well defined or standardized encryption/descryption algorithm. Proper citation made to the source of the encryption/decryption algorithm.	Excellent description using well defined or standardized encryption/descryption algorithm. Proper citation made to the source of the encryption/decryption algorithm. Includes compelling arguments justifying the selected method.		0	
3	Flowchart/pseudo code/Communication Diagrams/Sequence Diagrams describing the IPC algorithm and/or encryption/decryption algorithm **Note: Proper technical diagrams and/or C style pseudo code formats must be applied here to be eligible for marks. Mathematical style pseudocode is also accepted. No other forms of pseudocode will be accepted.**	2	Not provided.	Weak diagrams/pseudo code with noticeable amounts of diagram errors	Reasonable diagrams/pseudo code which captures the essence of the IPC algorithm and/or encryption/decryption algorithms but with small amounts of errors in the diagram	Detailed diagrams/pseudo code which captures in-depth the IPC algorithm and/or encryption/decryption algorithms and with minimal diagram errors. Some explanation of these diagrams are mentioned in the report.	**Thorough** diagrams/pseudo code which captures in-depth the IPC algorithm and/or encryption/decryption algorithms and with no diagram errors. Proper explanation of these diagrams are mentioned in the report.		0	
Sub-Total (4 marks)									0	

MONASH University

	PART C: RESULTS & DISCUSSION									
	Criteria	**Marks**	**0 (Unacceptable)**	**1 (Weak)**	**2 (Satisfactory)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Excellent)**	**Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)**	**Scaled marks**	**Comments**
1	Results tabulation and/or illustration	1	Not provided (system not working).	Little or no results to tabulate	Tabulated results which indicates details of the applied simulation scenario, which includes number of attempted runs, number of reported messages and a summary of events generated.	Tabulated results which indicates details of the applied simulation scenario, which includes number of attempted runs, number of reported messages and a summary of events generated. Includes screen shots of message logs before and after encryption and speed up analysis using OpenMP.	Tabulated results which indicates details of the applied simulation scenario, which includes number of attempted runs, number of reported messages, and a summary of events generated. Includes screen shots of message logs before and after encryption and speed up analysis using OpenMP. Additional charts are included to illustrate the number of triggered events over a period of time.		0	
2	Results observation and discussion	2	Not provided.	Limited explanation on the results. The derived inference is not compared against the proposed hypothesis.	Explanation covers results with some basic observation. The derived inference is compared against the proposed hypothesis.	Explanation covers results with a good amount of observation. The derived inference is compared against the proposed hypothesis. Includes analysis into communication time between nodes and the base station based on the exchanged messages, known issues and possible causes of these known issues.	Explanation covers results with a **thorough** amount of observation. The derived inference is compared against the proposed hypothesis. Includes analysis into communication time between nodes and the base station based on the exchanged messages, known issues and possible causes of these known issues.		0	
Sub-Total (3 marks)									0	

MONASH University

	PART D: CONCLUSION									
	Criteria	Marks	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Weak)	2 (Satisfactory)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)	Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)	Scaled marks	Comments
1	Concluding remarks and future work	1	Not provided.	Concluding paragraph is only remotely related to the report topic	Concluding paragraph follows and summarizes the report discussion and draws a conclusion.	Concluding paragraph summarizes and draws a clear conclusion and enhances the impact of the report. Includes a valid future work.	Concluding paragraph summarizes and draws a clear, effective conclusion and enhances the impact of the report. Includes more than one valid future work.		0	
Sub-Total (1 mark)									0	

MONASH University

	PART E: PENALTIES									
	Criteria	Penalty Marks	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Weak)	2 (Satisfactory)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)	Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)	Scaled Penalty marks	Comments
1	Grammar	2	Report not submitted	Writing exhibits a less than minimal command of the English language skills	Writing exhibits a minimal command of the English language skills	Writing exhibits an adequate command of language skills	Writing exhibits a good command of the English language skills	4	0	
2	Reference section	1	No reference section	Reference section is present but references are not properly formatted in an appropriate citation format (IEEE or APA).			Reference section is present and references are properly formatted in an appropriate citation format (IEEE or APA).	4	0	
3	Report Plagiarism	10	> 60% similarity identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	Between 40% and 60% in content similarity is identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	Between 20% and 40% in content similarity is identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	Between 10% and 20% in content similarity is identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	< 10% in content similarity is identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	4	0	
4	Late Submission	1 mark per day					Specify number of days in the next column ==>	0	0	
Sub-Total Penalty									0	

Total before penalty (10 marks):	0.00
Total after penalty (10 marks):	0.00

Total, DEMO+QA & Report (20 marks):	0.00