

Marking guidelines for CS7IS2 assignments 1 and 3

	Fail (<50%)	Pass (50-70%)	Distinction (70%+)
Implementation (30%)	Insufficient technical implementation of the code specifications, eg not all algorithms have been implemented, code crashes or gets stuck during execution.	All algorithms have been implemented but not following the sufficient coding standards and best practices, eg algorithms need to be run separately rather than integrated in a single interface, hardcoded values, poor or no documentation/comments.	All algorithms always work correctly for various combinations of parameters (including edge cases etc) and fully meet specifications. Code is integrated but modular, clean, understandable, well organized, well commented.
Experimental Evaluation and Performance Analysis (40%)	Insufficient experimental evaluation – some or all of the evaluation combinations are missing, eg algorithms have not been compared to each other, appropriate metrics have not been used, no or very few parameters were varied during comparison.	Sufficient but not overly extensive nor complete analysis has been performed – eg only some parameters were varied, only single metric was used for comparison, explanations for choice of metric(s) is are weak.	Exceptional in-depth analysis of algorithm performance against multiple dimensions using multiple metrics. Metrics and parameters choices are justified, explained and their impact on performance thoroughly evaluated. If applicable, multiple runs have been executed and statistical analysis of results performed. Complete raw data/results of analysis are well organized and been submitted with the report.
Report (30%)	Work of poor quality, arguments not sufficiently rooted in analysis of implementation and evaluation. Report contains incomplete and flawed explanations, evidence and argumentation. Lack of internal consistency. Makes insufficient or incorrect use of figures, diagrams, and tables.	The report presents coherent arguments but they are not as strongly backed up with experimental analysis. There are some discrepancies in organization, language and academic convention usage. Sufficient use of figures, diagrams, and tables, but not to exceptional standard.	Demonstrates excellent understanding of the algorithms, their applicability, comparison, and pros and cons of each, as shown through critical analysis. Arguments are extensively supported by the numerical analysis, using figures, tables, and diagrams where appropriate. Report is internally consistent, well organized and exceptionally argued. The report adheres throughout to academic conventions with respect to formatting and referencing and is carefully and effectively presented.