

CMEE Masters: Computing Coursework Assessment

Assignment Objectives: To work on a series of computing/programming exercises and problems in a coherent, modular, reproducible workflow under version control.

Note that:

- *The overall assessment will typically have significantly lesser marks than a simple weighted average of each week's points because the overall assessment is based on not just the "Computing Coursework Assessment Criteria", but also the "Marking Criteria for Exams, Essays and Coursework". Both sets of marking criteria are in the Assessment Appendix of the online TheMulQuaBio notes and git repository.*
- *In your 1:1 post-assessment feedback session, we will discuss where you gained or lost marks, and what you could have improved further. To the extent possible, please come with questions about specific scripts based upon the overall and weekly feedback you have received. This may require you to compare your code with the solution code in many cases.*

Student's Name: Jasmine Yang

1 Specific feedback

1.1 The Good (what you did well!)

1. Found all the core CMEE weekly directories in your parent directory.
2. Your organisation and code are generally tidy.
3. Your Git repo size when I checked week 7 was about 35 MB – relatively compact! This suggests you correctly suppressed unnecessary files from version control, and did not commit excessively. It could also mean that you did not commit enough, and/or somehow along the way lost parts of your git history – but we don't check these possibilities!
4. You had an overall readme file, (but this could have included more detail!). You also had one within each week. The weekly Readmes were clear and relatively detailed.
5. You have generally made a reasonable effort to modularise your Python code where appropriate. This is nice and Pythonic, and should be practised as much as possible!
6. Excellent job with the coding overall. Good attention to detail, only one noteworthy error, and minimal warnings. Well done also on remembering all the docstrings.
7. Your Groupwork practicals were all in order, and your group did well in collaborating on it. More feedback on this in the 1:1 sessions.

1.2 The Bad (errors, missing files, etc)

1. `oaks_debugme.py` tried to load data from `data/TestOaksData.csv` but this file was not included in your repo.

1.3 The Ugly (niggling issues like commenting, cosmetics, complexity of code, etc)

1. In your readmes you included some note to the language and version numbers, but could stand to include dependencies (e.g. packages) used as well. Also check out this resource: <https://github.com/jehna/readme-best-practices>. As you become a seasoned programmer, you will learn to make the readme file descriptions even more informative yet succinct.
2. You had a .gitignore to control which files were under version control, which is good, though you might also have opted to make week-specific exclusions. You will likely find this useful: <https://www.gitignore.io>.
3. Commenting could be improved – some of your scripts (e.g. `cfexercises2.py`) are not very helpfully commented, and you are occasionally (e.g. `boilerplate.py`) erring on the side of overly verbose comments, which is nonetheless better than not commenting at all, or too little! This will improve with experience, as you will begin to get a feel of what is "common-knowledge" among programmers, and what stylistic idioms are your own and require explanation. In general though, keep in mind that comments are most useful when used to pre-emptively explain somewhat complex logic or a somewhat unusual/counter-intuitive/non-obvious way of achieving something, rather than to describe in detail the meaning of a symbol, argument or function (that should be in the function docstring!).

2 Overall Assessment

Overall a very good job. Your code runs nearly without errors, is generally logically structured. Your commenting is slightly inconsistent but this should improve with practise. You appear to have built a solid foundation from which to progress as a programmer!

Provisional Mark: 77%

Signed: Alexander Kier Christensen & Samraat Pawar

March 23, 2022