Assessment Marking Criteria

Portfolio





Student Name		Student Number			
Unit Code/s & Name/s	ICTPRG547 Apply advanced programming skills in another language				
Cluster Name If applicable	N/A				
Assessment Type	☐ Assignment ☐ Project ☐ Case Study ☒ Portfolio ☐ Exam ☐ Third Party Report (Workplace) ☐ Third Party Report (Peer)				
Assessment Name	Java - Programming Portfolio of Evidence	Assessment Task No.	2 of 2		
Assessment Due Date	Week 16	Date Submitted	1 1		
Assessor Feedback:					
Attempt 1	Satisfactory □ Unsatis	factory □ Date	1 1		
Assessor Name	Assessor Signature				
☐ Student provided with feedback and reassessment arrangements (check box when completed)		Date scheduled for reassessment	1 1		
Attempt 2	Satisfactory Unsatis	factory Date	1 1		
Assessor Name		Assessor Signature			
Note to Assessor: Please record below any reasonable adjustment that has occurred during this assessment e.g. written assessment given orally.					

Assessment Criteria / Benchmarks		Attempt 1		Attempt 2	
The evidence submitted demonstrates that the student has satisfactorily:		Date//		Date//_	
Julion	actomy.	Υ	N	Y	N
PAF	RT 1. Environment setup				
1.1	Evidence that the requirements and documentation have been reviewed and articulated in email to Project Manager requestion requirements confirmation and in a meeting.				
1.2	Evidence of the review of the current <i>CD Archive Prototype</i> records from the <i>CD_ArchivePrototype_SampleData.txt</i> data file in 1.3 documentation.				
1.3	External documentation template has been used – in line with the development team's programming standards and the following application design sections have been completed: a) IPO chart b) TOE chart c) DFD d) Standard algorithms – using pseudocode e) Class diagram/s				
PART 2. Build the application – Code the solution					
2.1	Evidence of appropriate selection and use of an efficient user-defined data structures to code the functionality outlined in the <i>Scenario Script and Requirements</i> section on the previous pages. Evidence that the algorithms created in 1.3 have been followed and adhere to the Uptown IT code standards.				
a)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of a complex data structure to store the sample client data that the program reads in.				
b)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of a facility for the program operator to search for a record in this complex data structure.				
c)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of a facility to display the data read in – both as a list and as an individual record.				
d)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of three (3) sort methods that visibly manipulate portions of the data read in. These have been fully coded, and not utilise pre-defined sort functionality available within the programming language or associated IDE.				
e)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of a Doubly Linked List facility, as required by the specification and with appropriate search functionality.				
f)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of a Binary Tree facility, as				

	required by the specification and with appropriate search functionality			
g)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of an output table demonstrating the application of hashing techniques.			
h)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of inter-process communication between the components of the system being developed, as outlined within the scenario.			
i)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of an applicable programmed response to an operating system signal.			
j)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation of the identification and utilisation of a relevant third-party library. Applicable documentation associated with the third-party library has been noted and emailed to the project manager and client.			
k)	Evidence of the appropriate completion of unit testing utilising the IDE's debugging facilities in the ensuring the correct operation of the initial development code. Checking for syntactical, logical and design error.			
l)	Evidence of the appropriate implementation discussion re concerns and/or points of clarification with the project manager as the project proceeds. Reference to these have been made and to the feedback provided, in your closing email to the project manager			
PAR	RT 3. Program documentation			
3.1	Prepared appropriate internal documentation in the form of in-line comments in the code. Your code should follow your development team's programming standards .			
3.2	External documentation template has been used - line with the development team's programming standards and the following sections have been completed:			
	 Test plan Test cases report (file: ICTPRG543_Test_Cases_Report_Template.docx) User Manual Evidence of correspondence (email to Project Manager) 			
3.3	In relation to the review of the debugging and test procedures outlined in the development team's coding standards (<i>UptownIT_Java_Coding_Standards_Template.docx</i>), adjustments have been noted and added to the closing email to the manager as/where applicable.			
3.4	Prepared automated program documentation using a facility provided within the IDE (e.g. Javadoc) or an alternative.			
PART 4. Debugging and testing				
4.1	Provided evidence of use of debugging facilities available within the Integrated Development Environment (IDE) you are utilising.			

	Checking for syntactical, logical and design error. Screenshots				
	included in the external documentation template. Showing at least:				
	one breakpoint				
	a set of associated watches				
4.0	an instance of tracing through several lines of code Suidana that the Test Blanch as heart serviced out and results have				
4.2	Evidence that the Test Plan has been carried out, and results have been documented in the Test Cases Report (file:				
	UptownIT_Test_Cases_Report_Template.docx)				
4.3	Evidence that two (2) code optimisation techniques have been		<u> </u>		
	researched and applied.				
4.4	Application updated so as to resolve any errors, issues, optimisation adjustments, or oversights in relation to the original requirements				
	specification, which may have been noted during your testing.				
4.5	Prepared a supporting user manual appropriately considered and	П	П	П	Тп
	structured Included in the external documentation template.				
4.6	Prepared emails to your Project Manager and separately for your client regarding the details of the third party library utilised within the				
	application.				
4.7	Prepared closing email to the client regarding the completion of the				
4.0	development.				
4.8	Prepared closing email to Project Manager regarding the completion of the development, identifications of any areas of concern and				
	seeking approval.				
4.9	Code and documentation uploaded for signoff.				
PART 5. Contingency and advanced programming concepts					
5.1	Contingency task.				
5.2	Justification provided for the use of Doubly Linked List of Objects				
	Justification provided for the use of Doubly Linked List of Objects.				
5.3	Most appropriate data structure for the storage of an index and its associated index value proposed and explained.				
5.4	Outlined four (4) conditions that the subsequent selection of a sort				
	algorithm in a specific situation may depend on if Quick Sort cannot be utilised.				
5.5	Identified and explained two (2) advantages of using a hashing				
5.0	technique.				
5.6	One of the programming concepts that can be utilised in both inter-				
	process communication and operating system signals is Threads.				
	Analysis and justification provided for the use of Threads.				
	End of Marking Criteria				