

	Maximum Mark	Satisfactory (2)	Marginal (1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
Organization	2	The code is submitted in the TWO required files, with the required filenames. Merged code is ordered thoughtfully so that it is easier to follow	Most criteria in Satisfactory are present	Few or none of the criteria in Satisfactory are present
Completeness	2	All parts of the required task are included in the code (i.e. all the described filters are present and there is a test function for each filter)		
Documentation	2	The top of each file contains a header, identifying the current milestone, the group identifier, and the date of submission		
Authorship	2	Each function's docString contains the author(s)		
DocString	2	Each function contains appropriate type annotations and a well-constructed docString (what, not how; mentions each parameter; if necessary, explains the role of a parameter)		
DocString Tests	2	>>> Shell tests are included; tests cover boundary cases as well; if applicable, tests cover failed cases.		
Filter Body - Correct	2* 9	The body for a filter contains a complete implementation of the required algorithm that runs correctly as described in the Milestone description. Assess each of the 9 filter separately out of 2, therefore a total of 18		
Test Body - Correct	2 * 9	The body for all test functions correctly tests the content of the pixels for the given filter - comparing the actual value with an expected value. Assess each of the 9 test functions separately out of 2, therefore a total of 18		
Both Body - Efficiency	2	The code makes judicious use of variables, avoid repetitive code; Loops and conditionals are simple and well-constructed, appropriate to the given task.		
Both Body - Readability	2	The code uses simple standard approaches to the algorithm, that are easily readable, understandable. The code itself is well-spaced, and where needed, extra comments.		
Both Body - Code Standard	2	The code follows standard programming practices - well-formed variable names, upper-case CONSTANTS.		
Total		54		

Late assignments will not be accepted. The team will receive a zero.

This marking is meant to be detailed and provide meaningful feedback to the students. Work in depth. Work slowly.

Usually, the group should share the same mark

Exceptions: (1) there are ghost students or (2) the breakdown of the group has been noted or is obvious or (3) the variability in the code between functions is obvious and notable.

If there is such a need to assign different marks, please use the AUTHOR of the function to differentiate between parts of the work