12 SDD Assessment Task 1 Marking Guide

Question 1a)

Criteria	Marks
A clear classification of each language that includes a good justification.	3
A clear classification of each language.	2
An attempt at classifying each language.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 1b)

Criteria	Marks
A clear explanation for why assembly was described as rudimentary and a clear explanation for why it was still used.	2
An attempt at why assembly was described as rudimentary and why it was used.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 1c)

Criteria	Marks
A clear response that has a good comparison and contrast of imperative and object orientated languages	3
A response that compares and contrasts imperative and object orientated languages.	2
An attempt at comparing and contrasting imperative and object orientated languages.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 1d)

Criteria	Marks
A response that clearly explains why three different languages are used and not just one.	2
An attempt at explaining why three different languages are used and not just one.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 2a)

Criteria	Marks
All possible results are clearly detailed from running the code on line 22 with no errors.	2
Describes some of the possible results from running the code on line 22 or contains some errors.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 2b)

Criteria	Marks
The definition of a sibling is concise and without errors.	2
An attempt was made at a definition of a sibling, but is incomplete or contains some errors.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 3)

Criteria	Marks
A clear description of a Person attribute AND a Person method with one example of each and is without error.	2
An attempt was made at describing an attribute AND a method for the Person class.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 4)

Criteria	Marks
A fully working program, that complies without errors or warnings, created in C++ and demonstrates all the required features without logic or runtime errors. Is clearly documented.	12-14
A fully working program that compiles without errors but with warnings, created in C++ and demonstrates most of the required features without logic or runtime errors. Includes some documentation.	9-11
A C++ program that compiles without errors but with warnings and demonstrates some of the required features but has logic or runtime errors. Includes some documentation.	6-8
A C++ program, that doesn't compile but would demonstrates some understanding of some of the required features.	3-5
Attempt at the creation of a program in C++	1-2
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 5)

Criteria	Marks
A clear explanation of the required features including some practical demonstration.	4
A clear explanation of the required features.	3
An explanation of the required features.	2
An attempt at explaining the required features.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 6)

Criteria	Marks
A fully working program that complies without errors or warnings, created in Prolog that demonstrates all of the required features and is clearly documented.	7-8
A fully working program that compiles without errors and warnings, created in Prolog that demonstrates most of the required features with documentation.	5-6
A Prolog program that demonstrates some understanding of some of the required features with documentation.	3-4
Attempt at the creation of a program in Prolog	1-2
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 7)

Criteria	Marks
A clear explanation of the required features including some practical demonstration.	4
A clear explanation of the required features.	3
A explanation of the required features.	2
An attempt at explaining the required features.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Question 8)

Criteria	Marks
The feedback is clear, concise and addresses each of the required points for both code reviews.	4
The feedback addresses each of the required points for both code reviews.	3
The feedback addresses most of the required points for both code reviews.	2
An attempt at a code review is made.	1
Not attempted or a non-serious attempt.	0

Total	/50

Comments