Practical Set 1

Due: 11.59pm Friday 17th April 2020 Weight: 17% (+ 3% from checkpoint)

Note:

- This assessment is not a group assessment; collusion, plagiarism, cheating of any kind is not acceptable. Submitting your work to your TWA site signifies that the work uploaded is yours. If you cannot honestly certify that the work is your own then do not upload it to your TWA site. Breaches of the Misconduct Rule will be dealt with according to the university policy (see the learning guide for more information).
- Include code comments for your student ID, Name, and Practical Class Time at the top of each source file created (all html, css, js files)
- All files must be uploaded to your TWA web site in the **correct location before** submission due date.
- The **submission script** must then be used to submit your work once all work is on your TWA website. Failure to use this script will result in a non-submission.
- Ensure all HTML written is valid. Use http://validator.w3.org to confirm before submission

This assessment is an accumulation of weekly practical exercises from week 2 to week 5. Some of the work has already been checked for progress in checkpoint 1*. Practical Set 1 comprises the following exercises:

			Weight of Marking Criteria (see Rubric on page 2)			
Exercise	**From Week:**	**Question**	**Code Functionality/ Correctness**	**Code Readability**	**Form Design**	**Web Page Design**
A. 50% of Prac Set mark	**Week 2 practical**	Exercise 4*	50%	10%	0%	40%
		Exercise 5*				
		Exercise 6*				
	Week 3 practical	Exercise 2*				
B. 50% of Prac Set mark	**Week 5 practical**	Exercise 1	50%	10%	30%	10%
		Exercise 2				

All files relating to the above exercises must be uploaded to your TWA web site in the **correct folders** – see the weekly practical exercise documents for details.

Submission Instructions

To submit your Practical Set 1 you must do the following by the due date and time specified on page 1 of this document.

1. **Upload** all your practical files in the correct folders in your TWA web site on the TWA web server as instructed in each question
2. **Run the submission script** located at

   `https://twaaut.cdms.westernsydney.edu.au/submit/submit.asp`

   As part of the submission, you will be prompted for your TWA website username and password. You will then be asked to read the WSU policy on plagiarism and certify that work submitted by you is your own work. This action will be logged in a database for future reference and is deemed to be evidence that you claim that your work is original. Next, you will need to select from a drop down list the Practical Set you are submitting, eg,

Prac Set 1, and click the ”Submit Assessment” button. The web page will then display a listing of the files you have submitted along with a receipt number. You should print this page for proof of submission.

Referencing

Referencing must follow the guidelines given on pages 8-9 in Section 2.5.1 of the unit Learning Guide.

Marking Criteria and Standards (Rubric)

The marking criteria and standards for Practical Set 1 are found on pages 9-10 of section 2.5.1 in the Learning Guide (reproduced below) and will be used to assess **each question** in this Practical Set **according to the specific weightings identified above for each question**.

CRITERIA	Unacceptable	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Code Functionality and Correctness* (See weighting for each question in table on page 1)	Functional item(s) do not execute because of errors; output is correct **for less than 25% of marking** test cases; no error checking code included as required by question; output is simply dumped to the screen without any semblance of logic or thought – the user would be confused by this output	Functional item(s) executes but with some errors or handles some special cases correctly; the functional item(s) contains very minimal error checking code as required by the question; functional items(s) output is correct **for at least 25% of marking** test cases; output is simple written to the screen without any clear organisation or thought - the user would find it hard to understand	Functional item(s) executes without errors and handles some special cases correctly; the functional item(s) contains most error checking code as required by the question; output is correct **for at least 50% of marking** test cases; output is well organised for some function points and is generally easy for the user to understand	Functional item(s) executes without errors and handles most special cases correctly; the functional item(s) contains most error checking code as required by the question; output is correct **for at least 75% of marking** test cases; output is well organised and is mostly easy for the user to understand	Functional item(s) executes without errors and handles all special cases correctly; the functional item(s) contains thorough error checking code as required by the question; output is correct for all marking test cases; output is very well organised and is easy for the user to understand
Code Readability (See weighting for each question in table on page 1)	Incorrect or inappropriate use of white space and indentation; the code is poorly organised and very difficult to read.	The code is readable only by someone who knows what it is supposed to be doing	The code is fairly easy to read but either incor-rect/inappropriate use of white space or indentation	The code is quite well organised and is generally easy to follow; correct / appropriate use of white space and/or indentation	The code is exceptionally well organised and very easy to follow; correct / appropriate use of white space and indentation.

Form Design (See weighting for each question in table on page 1)	No effort in form design shown; user accessibility standards have not been employed; inappropriate input devices chosen	Limited form design; the form is only usable by someone that knows what is expected; user accessibility standards have been employed in only very minor ways; some input devices chosen are appropriate but most are not	Reasonable form design employed; some of the applicable user accessibility standards have been employed within the form; less than 60% of input devices chosen are appropriate	Good form design employed; most applicable user accessibility standards have been employed within the form; most input devices chosen are appropriate	Excellent form design employed; all applicable user accessibility standards have been employed within the form; all input devices chosen are appropriate
Web Page Design (See weighting for each question in table on page 1)	No effort in page design shown; user accessibility standards have not been employed where appropriate	Limited page design; the page layout, colours, images, and text artefacts show limited effort and understanding of importance to the user experience; user accessibility standards have been employed in only very minor ways	Reasonable page design employed; the page layout, colours, images, and text artefacts show moderate effort and understanding of importance to the user experience; some of the applicable user accessibility standards have been employed where appropriate	Good page design employed; the page layout, colours, images, and text artefacts show good effort and understanding of importance to the user experience; most applicable user accessibility standards have been employed where appropriate	Excellent page design employed; the page layout, colours, images, and text artefacts show excellent effort and understanding of importance to the user experience; all applicable user accessibility standards have been employed where appropriate

* As a special case, if a program does not render or execute it is still possible to receive partial marks in this criterion at the markers discretion. This is dependent if there are clear attempts at the logic or what is required of the question or task.