Marking Guidelines for Assignments

Grade Mark	Overall Quality of Report (10%)	Specification (10%)	Analysis (10%)	Algorithm Design (10%)	Implementation (35%)	Robustness (10%)	Testing (15%)
A++ 90%–100%	Clear and structured; all aspects covered; fluent and succinct presentation; logically developed and coherent	Shows critical understanding of functional requirements and knowledge	Data requirements, and system constraints described succinctly but in enough detail	Clear and structured; all aspects covered; appropriate design techniques used; design shows exceptional degree of originality and is novel	Delivers novel solutions to problems encountered; a standard coding style followed strictly and throughout , the comments clear and succinct	The program has very good robustness which can work in many different situations.	Shows thorough testing, all aspects of system tested; well-chosen examples; system works as expected for all examples
A+ 80%–89%	Clear and structured; all aspects covered; fluent and succinct presentation; logically developed and coherent	Shows critical understanding of functional requirements and knowledge	Data requirements, and system constraints described succinctly but in enough detail	Clear and structured; all aspects covered; appropriate design techniques used; design shows some originality	Delivers realistic solutions to problems encountered; a clear coding style followed, the comments clear and succinct	The program has very good robustness which can work in many different situations.	Shows thorough testing, all aspects of system tested; well-chosen examples; system works as expected for all examples
A 70%–79%	Clear and structured; all aspects covered; fluent and succinct presentation; logically developed and coherent	Shows comprehensive understanding of functional requirements and knowledge with the ability to put the work into context and to critically evaluate selected aspects of the work	Data requirements, and system constraints described clearly but in enough detail	Clear and structured; all aspects covered; appropriate design techniques used	Delivers appropriate solutions to complex problems encountered; coding style followed well; the comments clear	The program has good robustness which can work in several different situations.	Shows thorough testing, all aspects of system tested; well-chosen examples; system works as expected for all examples
B 60%–69%	Most clear but may not be structured well; most aspects covered; mostly fluent and succinct presentation; mostly logically developed and coherent	Shows good understanding of functional requirements and knowledge, with no major gaps or omissions, but minor gaps or omissions may occur	Data requirements, and system constraints described in sufficient detail	Mostly clear but may not be structured; most aspects covered; appropriate design techniques used	Delivers appropriate solutions to most problems encountered; coding style followed well; the comments are clear	The program has good robustness which can work in several different situations.	Most aspects of system tested; most examples chosen are appropriate; system works as expected for most examples

Grade Mark	Overall Quality of Report (10%)	Specification (10%)	Analysis (10%)	Algorithm Design (10%)	Implementation (35%)	Robustness (10%)	Testing (15%)
C 50%–59%	Report is satisfactory but may lack in depth or breadth; some aspects omitted; satisfactory presentation; partly logically developed	Shows satisfactory understanding of functional requirements and knowledge, with the ability to integrate information but lacking in depth or breadth	Data requirements, and system constraints described in some detail	Design is satisfactory but may lack in depth or breadth; some aspects omitted; design techniques used are mostly appropriate	Delivers satisfactory solutions to some problems encountered; coding style followed; the comments complete	The program can only work in some restricted situations.	Some aspects of system tested; some examples chosen are appropriate; system works as expected for some examples
D 40%–49%	Unclear report with some faults; quite some aspects omitted; clumsy and repetitive presentation; not logically developed	Shows general understanding of functional requirements and knowledge but very limited in depth or breadth	Data requirements, and system constraints description displays some deficiencies and omissions	Unclear design with some faults; quite some aspects omitted; suitable design techniques used for a good part but with flaws in use or with omissions	Flaws in some solutions to problems encountered; coding style followed not completely; some comments missing	The program can only work in some restricted situations.	Some aspects of system tested; Only very few examples are chosen appropriately; system only works for a small portion of the examples
E 30%–39%	Displays deficiencies and omissions in a large proportion of the report	Shows limited or fragmented understanding of functional requirements and knowledge, with some aspects displaying fundamental errors and omissions	Data requirements, and system constraints described poorly	Suitable design methods are used to some extend but with flaws in use or omissions which negatively impacts on the work	Deficiencies in most solutions to problems encountered; coding style followed not completely; the comments missing or not exist	The program has poor robustness which can only work in very different case.	Many aspects of system not tested; examples chosen are not appropriate; system does not work for almost all examples
F 10%–29%	Displays serious deficiencies and omissions in a large proportion of the report	Shows incomplete understanding of functional requirements and very limited range of knowledge, with numerous errors of interpretation	Data requirements, and system constraints described poorly	Serious lack of the use of suitable design methods and/or serious deficiencies and omissions in most of the design	Unable to deal with most problems encountered; no coding style applied; no comments used.	The program has poor robustness which can only work in very different case.	Almost no testing was described
G 0%–9%	Displays serious deficiencies and omissions in most of the report	Virtually devoid of any evidence of understanding of functional requirements and knowledge	The student does not know what the assignment is about	No use of design methods or virtually no design is given	Virtually no understanding of material or virtually no realization is given	There is no sign of the consideration of robustness.	No testing was described