

FIT1008 - Intro to Computer Science
Assessed Prac 2 - Marking Rubric

Semester 1, 2018

CRITERIA	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD
Task 1 - 9 marks			
Program quality and documentation	Low quality solution which could include no documentation, no testing or a poorly designed solution. (0 marks)	Acceptable level of documentation, some test cases with an average implementation. (1 mark)	Well documented, thoroughly tested with clear and readable. (2 marks)
Student understanding	No evidence for understanding the solution. (0 marks)	Small gaps in understanding the solution, student is capable of answering most questions about the code. (2.25 marks)	The student clearly articulates the logic behind the solution and can explain and tweak the approach undertaken. (4.5 marks)
Correct output	Only some of the methods are implemented. (0 marks)	Most methods implemented correctly. (1.25 marks)	All methods implemented correctly with a Array-Based List including making the List iterable. (2.5 marks)

Task 2 - 2 marks			
Program quality and documentation	Low quality solution which could include no documentation, no testing or a poorly designed solution. (0 marks)	Acceptable level of documentation, some test cases with an average implementation. (0.25 marks)	Well documented, thoroughly tested with clear and readable. (0.5 marks)
Student understanding	No evidence for understanding the solution. (0 marks)	Small gaps in understanding the solution, student is capable of answering most questions about the code. (0.5 marks)	The student clearly articulates the logic behind the solution and can explain and tweak the approach undertaken. (1 mark)
Correct output	The array is not resizable. (0 marks)	Incorrectly resizes the array. A new array should be created and the values copied over. (0.25 marks)	All methods updated correctly with correct reconstruction of the array for shrinking and enlarging. (0.5 marks)

Task 3 - 2 marks			
Program quality and documentation	Low quality solution which could include no documentation, no testing or a poorly designed solution. (0 marks)	Acceptable level of documentation, some test cases with an average implementation. (0.25 marks)	Well documented, thoroughly tested with clear and readable. (0.5 marks)
Student understanding	No evidence for understanding the solution. (0 marks)	Small gaps in understanding the solution, student is capable of answering most questions about the code. (0.5 marks)	The student clearly articulates the logic behind the solution and can explain and tweak the approach undertaken. (1 mark)
Correct output	Incorrect implementation of the Linked list class. (0 marks)	Most of the methods implemented correctly. (0.25 marks)	Correct implementation of Linked List class including iteration and resizing. (0.5 marks)

Task 4 - 2 marks			
Program quality including documentation	Low quality solution which could include no documentation, no testing or a poorly designed solution. (0 marks)	Acceptable level of documentation, some test cases with an average implementation. (0.25 mark)	Well documented, thoroughly tested with clear and readable. (0.5 marks)
Student understanding	No evidence for understanding the solution. (0 marks)	Small gaps in understanding the solution, student is capable of answering most questions about the code. (0.5 marks)	The student clearly articulates the logic behind the solution and can explain and tweak the approach undertaken. (1 mark)
Correct output	Read function not working correctly. (0 marks)	Small errors in the readFile. (0.25 marks)	Function is implemented and working correctly. (0.5 mark)

Task 5 - 6 marks			
------------------	--	--	--

Program quality including documentation	Low quality solution which could include no documentation, no testing or a poorly designed solution. (0 marks)	Acceptable level of documentation, some test cases with an average implementation. (0.5 marks)	Well documented, thoroughly tested with clear and readable. (1 mark)
Student understanding	No evidence for understanding the solution. (0 marks)	Small gaps in understanding the solution, student is capable of answering most questions about the code. (1.5 marks)	The student clearly articulates the logic behind the solution and can explain and tweak the approach undertaken. (3 marks)
Correct output	None of the menu functions operate correctly. (0 marks]	Some of the menu functions operate correctly. (1 mark)	All menu functions work correctly with correct input validation. (2 marks)

Task 6 - 4 marks			
Program quality including documentation	Low quality solution which could include no documentation, no testing or a poorly designed solution. (0 marks)	Acceptable level of documentation, some test cases with an average implementation. (0.5 marks)	Well documented, thoroughly tested with clear and readable. (1 mark)
Student understanding	No evidence for understanding the solution. (0 marks)	Small gaps in understanding the solution, student is capable of answering most questions about the code. (1 mark)	The student clearly articulates the logic behind the solution and can explain and tweak the approach undertaken. (2 marks)
Correct output	Required more than one change to add the linked list implementation. (0 marks)	Performance analysis not included. (0.5 marks)	Correct Linked List implementation with a performance analysis. (1 mark)