

STUDENT'S NAME:			
ID NO:			
UNIT CODE AND TITLE: FIT3143 PARALLEL COMPUTING			
SEM/YEAR: 2/2019			
CAMPUS: CLAYTON/MALAYSIA			
<b>ASSIGNMENT 1 - REPORT (10 MARKS)</b>			
ASSESSOR:			
DATE:		TIME:	

**PART A: ABSTRACT & INTRODUCTION**

	Criteria	Marks	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Weak)	2 (Satisfactory)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)	Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)	Scaled marks	Comments
1	Abstract	1	No abstract	Weak abstract without any summary of results from the assignment and missing keywords.	Plausible description, contains a legitimate method and results, but somewhat broad with basic. Keywords included.	Abstract is well articulated with a legitimate method and clear results (e.g., actual speed up). Keywords included.	Abstract is clearly articulated with a persuasive legitimate method, original opinion and clear results. Keywords included.		0	
2	Introduction	1	No introduction	Weak introduction with an inadequate overview of the assignment objectives, concepts and hypothesis.	A basic overview of the assignment. The objectives, concepts and hypothesis of the assignment is presented albeit not clear.	An adequate overview of the assignment. The objectives of the assignment is presented. The mathematics and description of a Mandelbrot set is provided with citations. An hypothesis is presented which describes the method applied to parallelize the Mandelbrot set computation.	An <b>thorough</b> overview of the assignment. The objectives of the assignment is presented. The mathematics and description of a Mandelbrot set is provided with citations. An clear and concrete hypothesis is presented which describes the method applied to parallelize the Mandelbrot set computation.		0	
Sub-Total (2 marks)									0	

**PART B: THEORETICAL ANALYSIS & PARALLEL PARTITION DESIGN**

	Criteria	Marks	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Weak)	2 (Satisfactory)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)	Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)	Scaled marks	Comments
1	Theoretical speed up analysis of a Mandelbrot Set	1	Not provided.	Weak analysis	Adequate analysis using Amdahl's law .	Good analysis using Amdahl's law with additional arguments.	Excellent analysis using Amdahl's law with additional arguments including usage of Bernstein's condition to proof the data parallelism viability of a Mandelbrot set.		0	
3	Technical illustration and description of the parallel partitioning method used	1	Not provided.	Weak illustration and with little or no description	Adequate illustration of the method in identifying the parallel partitioning method	A detailed illustration of the method in identifying the parallel partitioning method along with a clear description of the selected method	A <b>thorough</b> illustration of the method in identifying the parallel partitioning method along with a clear description of the selected method. Comparison with other possible parallel partitioning designs are included the justify the selection of the proposed partitioning scheme.		0	
4	Flowchart/pseudo code describing the parallel partitioned algorithm	2	Not provided.	Weak flow chart/pseudo code with noticeable amounts of diagram errors	Reasonable flow chart/pseudo code which captures the essence of the parallel algorithm but with small amounts of errors in the diagram	A detailed flow chart/pseudo code which captures the in depth the parallel algorithm and with minimal diagram errors	A <b>thorough</b> flow chart/pseudo code which captures the in depth the parallel algorithm and with no diagram errors		0	
<b>Sub-Total (4 marks)</b>									0	

**PART C: RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

	Criteria	Marks	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Weak)	2 (Satisfactory)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)	Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)	Scaled marks	Comments
2	Results tabulation and/or illustration	1	Not provided (system not working).	Little or no results to tabulate	Tabulated results which indicates a minimum test on 2 logical processors	Tabulated results which are equivalent to the sample table in the assignment specifications and includes additional charts	Tabulated results which exceeds the depth of the sample table in the assignment specifications and includes additional charts		0	
3	Results observation and discussion	2	Not provided.	Limited explanation on the results. The derived inference is not compared against the proposed hypothesis.	Explanation covers results with some basic observation. The derived inference is compared against the proposed hypothesis.	Explanation covers results with a good amount of observation. The derived inference is compared against the proposed hypothesis. Includes speed up scalability analysis, known issues and possible causes of these known issues.	Explanation covers results with a <b>thorough</b> amount of observation. The derived inference is compared against the proposed hypothesis. Includes speed up scalability analysis, known issues and possible causes of these known issues.		0	
Sub-Total (3 marks)									0	

**PART D: CONCLUSION**

	Criteria	Marks	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Weak)	2 (Satisfactory)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)	Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)	Scaled marks	Comments
1	Concluding remarks and future work	1	Not provided.	Concluding paragraph is only remotely related to the report topic	Concluding paragraph follows and summarizes the report discussion and draws a conclusion.	Concluding paragraph summarizes and draws a clear conclusion and enhances the impact of the report. Includes a valid future work.	Concluding paragraph summarizes and draws a clear, effective conclusion and enhances the impact of the report. Includes more than one valid future work.		0	
Sub-Total (1 mark)									0	

**PART E: PENALTIES**

	Criteria	Penalty Marks	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Weak)	2 (Satisfactory)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)	Rating Awarded by Assessor (1 - 4)	Scaled Penalty marks	Comments
1	Grammar	2	Report not submitted	Writing exhibits a less than minimal command of the English language skills	Writing exhibits a minimal command of the English language skills	Writing exhibits an adequate command of language skills	Writing exhibits a good command of the English language skills	4	0	
2	Reference section	1	No reference section	Reference section is present but references are not properly formatted in an appropriate citation format (IEEE or APA).			Reference section is present and references are properly formatted in an appropriate citation format (IEEE or APA).	4	0	
3	Report Plagiarism	10	> 60% similarity identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	Between 40% and 60% in content similarity is identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	Between 20% and 40% in content similarity is identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	Between 10% and 20% in content similarity is identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	< 10% in content similarity is identified with another student's report or an external source without proper citation.	4	0	
4	Late Submission	1								
<b>Sub-Total Penalty</b>									<b>0</b>	

Note: Late submission penalty will be added separately

<b>Total before penalty (10 marks):</b>
<b>Total after penalty (10 marks):</b>

<b>0</b>
<b>0</b>