ASSIGNMENT FEEDBACK RECORD

MARKING CRITERIA - ALGORITHMS & PROGRAMMING (TEAM-BASED)

UNIVERSITY of BRADFORD

Module Code:	Module Title:	Department:
COS4015-B	Technical and Professional Skills	Computer Science

Team Number:	Team Members:	Mark:

PSEUDOCODE	Weight	1	2	3	4	Grade	Mark
Completeness	10%	Pseudocode is written poorly; most sections and structures are incomplete and unclear	Pseudocode is written to a satisfactory standard; some sections and structures are complete and clear, but some issues	Pseudocode is written to a good standard; most sections and structures are complete and clear, but minor issues	Pseudocode is written to an excellent standard; all sections and structures are complete and clear	0	0.00
Format and style	5%	Significant number of issues	Pseudocode partially uses standard style and format; but some issues	Pseudocode mostly uses standard style and format; but minor issues	Pseudocode perfectly uses standard style and format	0	0.00
Similarity with programme	5%	There is very little similarity between pseudocode and programme	Pseudocode is partially similar to programme; but there are some differences	Pseudocode is mostly similar to programme; but there are minor differences	Pseudocode is perfectly in line with programme	0	0.00
FLOW CHART	**Weight**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Grade**	**Mark**
Completeness	10%	Flow chart is presented poorly; most parts and structures are incomplete and unclear	Flow chart is presented to a satisfactory standard; some parts and structures are complete and clear, but some issues	Flow chart is presented to a good standard; most parts and structures are complete and clear, but minor issues	Flow chart is presented to an excellent standard; all parts and structures are complete and clear	0	0.00
Format and style	5%	Significant number of issues	Flow chart symbols & processes are partially correct; but some issues	Most flow chart symbols and processes are correctly represented; but minor	All flow chart symbols and processes are correctly represented	0	0.00
Similarity with pseudocode	5%	There is very little similarity between flow chart and pseudocode	Flow chart is partially similar to pseudocode; but there are some differences	Flow chart is mostly similar to pseudocode; but there are minor differences	Flow chart is perfectly in line with pseudocode	0	0.00
COMPLEXITY	**Weight**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Grade**	**Mark**
Correctness of calculations	15%	Complexity calculations are not correct	Complexity calculations are partially correct with some mistakes	Complexity calculations are mostly correct, but minor mistakes	Complexity calculations are fully correct	0	0.00
Justification	5%	Almost no justification provided	Limited justification provided for comlexity analysis with some issuess	Good justification provided for complexity analysis, but minor issues	Excellent justification provided for complexity analysis	0	0.00
IMPLEMENTATION	**Weight**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Grade**	**Mark**
Programme	15%	Programme is not working	Programme is partially working with very few test cases	Programme is mostly working using a limited range of test cases	Programme is fully working using a wide range of test cases	0	0.00
Generic vs specific	15%	Solution does hardly cover the use case given in the problem	Solution is specific to the use case given in the problem	Solution is partially generic; i.e. it covers the use case given in the problem and some other cases	Solution is very generic, i.e. it covers the use case given in the problem and many other cases	0	0.00
Coding style and Organisation	5%	Very little coding practices; disorganisaed; major lapses in organisation	Limited attention to coding practices and organisation	Good coding practices and organisation; but minor issues	Excellent coding practices and organisation	0	0.00
Comments	5%	Almost no comments	Limited attention to comments	Good comments, but not systematic	Excellent and systematic comments throught code	0	0.00
						TOTAL	**0**

Additional Comments

Marker - Print name:	Date:
2nd Consideration - Print name:	Date: