GENERAL RULES AND EVALUATION

REGLAS DEL JUEGO

1. GENERAL RULES

- You may write your code in MatLab/Octave/Julia or Python
- The documentation may be written in English or Spanish.
- Groups may have between 3 and 4 members and should write a single document.
- What you should submit:
  - A **pdf document** (ideally less than 10 pages) that contains arguments and results.
    - Results for each task in the project
    - Mention how the results relate to the theory presented in course.
    - (Optional) Bibliography. If you refer to Books, I want a reference to a **page**!
  - A compressed archive (I prefer ZIP) containing all **codes** (of your selected language) that you used to produce the results (*i.e.* functions, scripts).
    In particular, the archive must contain a script that reproduces the results shown in your document, *e.g.*, see the files `script_31.m` and `script_32.m` in the Sample-Project.
  - **PEER grades (5 %):** After the submission of a project each member of each group is obligated to send a **private email** to me grading his group members with a number $\in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, 10\}$ and (at least) one comment. The **subject should start** with $[CN]$ (Cálculo Numérico) or $[PL]$ (Programación Lineal),
- Your code should have comments where required. A good code does barely require comments, since you can use descriptive names for variables/constants and functions. Implementation details which do not coincide with the course (*e.g.* optimisations) should be commented or a reference should be given.

2. How I evaluate a project

- The idea of the projects is to implement methods and verify if the theory applies. In this sense, when you apply a method in a project I expect that you argue whether the hypothesis of the theory (seen in the course or your reference) are satisfied.

- **Group grades (95 %):** Incorrect results in your document affect your grades. The less severe your mathematical errors are, the more points you obtain. More importantly, the numerical values that appear in your document need to be reproduced by your code. This appears in the evaluation as the *factor numérico*, *e.g.*

  $$\begin{aligned}(\text{points for task 1}) = &(\text{points for theory questions and verifying hypothesis})\\ &+ (\text{factor numérico}) \cdot (\text{points for correct values of task 1}).\end{aligned}$$

  I consider the *factor numérico* equals:

  1, when your script reproduces the results shown in your document.
  $\frac{1}{2}$, when your script reproduces results different from your document.
  0, if the script is not present or I cannot make it work.

- **PEER grades (5 %):** The grades I obtain from your emails (see general rules) are averaged per student and are worth up to .5 of the personal grade for each student.

See below for the evaluation of the sample project.

Group Member grades

Nº	Nombre	C. Unica	sample project					Evaluation By peers (5%)		
			Group	Group Result	Peers Average	combined				
				10	10	10	Calificación			
1	Miembro 1	007000001	1	7.50	10.00	7.63	**7.63**	10	10	10
2	Miembro 2	007000002	1	7.50	8.00	7.53	**7.53**	9	8	7
3	Miembro 3	007000003	1	7.50	1.33	7.19	**7.19**	4	0	0
4	Miembro 4	007000004	1	7.50	1.33	7.19	**7.19**	0	4	0
		Promedio		75%	52%	7.4	**7.4**			

You will only see the columns with a yellow head

Group evaluation (95%)

Documento de Grupo:	1	óptimo
Ejercicio 3.1 (theory) mentioned:		
f continuous	1.00	1.00
exact because affine	1.00	1.00
Ejercicio 3.1 (values)		
a	1.00	1.00
b	1.00	1.00
c	1.00	1.00
Ejercicio 3.2 (theory) found:		
Composite formula	1.00	1.00
Correct exact value	1.00	1.00
Ejercicio 3.2 (values)		
a Table	3.00	3.00
Extras/Penalizacion:	0.00	

E3.1 *theory	2.00	2.00	
E3.1 *values	3.00	3.00	
Factor numérico	2/3	1	e.g. script did not contain code to reproduce b
E3.2 *theory	2.0	2	
E3.2 *values	3.00	3.00	
Factor numérico	1/2	1	e.g. script produced results different from the table
Extras	0.00		
Calificación:	7.50	10.00	