INST0004: Programming 2 [Optional Checkers Game]
Dr Daniel Onah

Competition Grading

This group work will be graded through your code and optional demonstration during the plenary session. Be prepare to submit your final code in week 7 directly to me in a zip file.

Marking Scheme

Your work will be marked based on the following three categories. Your final grade will be determined based on a weighted mean of these grades according to the weighting show in the table below.

Grading	**Percent (%)**
Functionality	50%
Code Structure and Elegance	40%
Code Style and commenting	10%

In all cases a grade descriptor (A, B, C, D, F) will be used to mark your work in each category. The following sections describe what is expected to attain each of these grades in each category.

The markers can also recommend the award of a distinction (+) category overall if we feel a piece of work exhibits clearly demonstrable good programming practice.

Game Functionality	
A	Fully working program meeting all requirements of Tasks 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5
B	Working program meeting all requirements of Tasks 1, 2, 3 and 4
C	Working program meeting all requirements for Tasks 1, 2 and 3
D	Working program meeting all requirements of Task 1
F	No working program demonstrated, or program does not meet requirements of Task 1.

Code Structure and Elegance	
A	Well written, clearly structured code showing students' own examples of good OO practice
B	Well written, clearly structured code
C	Clearly identifiable but **occasional** weakness, such as repetitive code that could be removed through use of a loop, poor use of public/private, unnecessary/unused code, inappropriate naming convention and scoping of variables
D	Clearly identifiable systematic weakness, such as multiple examples of repetitive code that could be removed through use of a loop, systematically poor use of public/private, large sections of unnecessary/ used code, consistently inappropriate named and scoped variables.
F	If all of the above failed.

Code Style and Commenting	
A	Consistently well indented, well named and well scoped variables with Javadoc commenting.
B	One code block showing poor naming , scope or indentation or occasionally vague and/or inaccurate comments.
C	Two or Three code blocks showing poor naming, scope or indentation, code is partially commented or systematically vague and/or inaccurate comments.
D	Four or five code blocks showing poor naming, scope or indentation or comments
F	Five or more code blocks showing poor naming, scope or indentation or comments.

Star Categories:

By showing a demonstrable example of additional work and /or good programming practice, you will be awarded a star (*) grade to your work. If you feel your work shows additional merit beyond the specification, do comment on this and show the merit in your comments. Example of a start award would be for a functionality complete draughts simulator (including

crowning, movement of the king pieces and detecting the end of game/winner). The use of GitHub version control to collaborate on the project and including the link for download.

Desert Rose☺