

CMEE Masters: Computing Coursework Assessment

Assignment Objectives: To work on a series of computing/programming exercises and problems in a coherent, modular, reproducible workflow under version control.

Note that:

- *The overall assessment will typically have significantly lesser marks than a simple weighted average of each week's points because the overall assessment is based on not just the "Computing Coursework Assessment Criteria", but also the "Marking Criteria for Exams, Essays and Coursework". Both sets of marking criteria are in the Assessment Appendix of the online TheMulQuaBio notes and git repository.*
- *In your 1:1 post-assessment feedback session, we will discuss where you gained or lost marks, and what you could have improved further. To the extent possible, please come with questions about specific scripts based upon the overall and weekly feedback you have received. This may require you to compare your code with the solution code in many cases.*

Student's Name: Izie Wood

1 Specific feedback

1.1 The Good (what you did well!)

1. Found all the core CMEE weekly directories in your parent directory.
2. Your organisation and code are logical and tidy, with the sole exception of a missing data/subdirectory in Week7.
3. Your Git repo size when I checked week 7 was about 23 MB – not overly large. This suggests you correctly suppressed unnecessary files from version control, and did not commit excessively. It could also mean that you did not commit enough, and/or somehow along the way lost parts of your git history – but we don't check these possibilities!
4. You had an overall readme file, as well as one within each week. The Readmes were clear, and comprehensive, even including info like dependencies and language version numbers. Good work! Also check out this resource: <https://github.com/jehna/readme-best-practices>. As you become a seasoned programmer, you will learn to make the readme file descriptions even more informative yet succinct.
5. Excellent job with the coding overall. Good attention to detail, with only one significant error (see below), and not too many warnings (some in R but these seem mostly to be relating to soon-to-be deprecated packages/modules, rather than your own coding). Your commenting is very thorough, but not intrusive.
6. You have generally made an effort to modularise your code where appropriate. This is a good habit to get into for Python. Good job also remembering all the docstrings and having only one significant error in all of your code.
7. Your Groupwork practicals were all in order, and your group did well in collaborating on it. More feedback on this in the 1:1 sessions.

1.2 The Bad (errors, missing files, etc)

1. `oaks_debugme.py` threw a `FileNotFoundError` since `data/TestOaksData.csv` could not be found. Indeed there was no `data/` subdirectory in your `Week7` directory at all!

1.3 The Ugly (niggling issues like commenting, cosmetics, complexity of code, etc)

1. You had a `.gitignore` to control which files were under version control, which is good, though you might also have opted to make week-specific exclusions. You will likely find this useful: <https://www.gitignore.io>.

2 Overall Assessment

Overall an excellent job! Clean, well documented and almost error-free code. You appear to have built a very solid foundation on which to continue your development as a programmer.

Provisional Mark: 82%

Signed: Alexander Kier Christensen & Samraat Pawar

March 23, 2022