Due Date

Friday of Week 8 (Friday 16th of Sept.), 11.59pm.

Assessment Weight

20% of marks for the subject, split 10% for the Software component and 10% for the written submission.

Assessment of Software Component

The Software component will be assessed in terms of functionality. The assessor will compile and run your program in their Ubuntu VM, and try to use the functionality of the GUI to share files. All of the functionality of the GUI will be tested, including changing the configuration settings, etc. The marks for the software component are roughly distributed evenly over the functionality.

Some other aspects that are assessed as we have discussed earlier:

- only modify those parts of the skeleton code that you are allowed to, as described in `IdxSrv.md` (instructions to students) in the skeleton repository;
- your `Filesharer` must work with the `IdxSrv` as provided in the skeleton code repository, and your `Filesharer` must work with our `Filesharer` implementation;
- if your program fails to operate as expected, the assessor may look at your source code to see if partial marks can be awarded; good programming style will help the assessor to see clearly whether partial grades can be awarded;
- if the assessor sees an aspect of your program that is significantly poor in terms of design/logic (as I discussed in lectures), then some marks may be lost, irrespective of whether the functionality is achieved during the testing period.

For clarification, if your `Filesharer` becomes unresponsive to the point that the assessor thinks it has crashed then this may be treated as failing to operate as expected.

Quality Assessment Guidelines

A general rubric that we are using in this subject is provided below. It is not criteria with each criterion worth some defined points. Rather it is a statement of quality expectations for each grade. Your feedback for your written assessment should make it clear, with respect to the quality expectations below, why your submission has received a certain grade, with exact marks being the judgement of the assessor.

In this project, the answer to each question will be assesed with respect to the quality expectations; even though each answer is a relatively short text answer.

As well, please bear in mind that assessors are acting more as a consistent reference point than as an absolute authority. Therefore while you may disagree with the view point of the assessor in the feedback that is given, for reasons of consistency of assessment it is usually the case that such disagreement does not lead to changes in marks.

Quality expectations:

- >=80% - H1. A very good, excellent or outstanding discussion, with at most only minor improvements to conceptual expression or wording that can be identified. A grade in this range is generally considered to reflect the possibility of continuing with research higher degree study in the future and usually about 10% to 20% of students would be awarded this grade.
- 70%-79% - H2. A good discussion with no significant shortcomings, however there are one or more aspects of the discussion that can be clearly improved. Some concepts may be awkwardly expressed or in doubt.
- 65%-69% - H3. A reasonable discussion that addresses the question but with one aspect of the discussion that is significantly poor in writing style, understanding or missing all together. Usually 75% of students would receive a grade of H3 or above.
- 50%-64% - P. The discussion does not entirely address the question - it is considered to be off topic in some ways, and there is more than one aspect that is significantly poor in writing style, understanding or missing all together.
- 0%-49% - F. The discussion shows a clear lack of understanding/effort, or clearly misunderstood or underestimated what was expected and/or has significant writing style issues. Usually less than 5% of students would receive this grade.

When considering writing style, The "Five C's of Writing" is adapted here as a guideline for writing/assessing a discussion:

- Clarity - is the discussion clear in what it is trying to communicate? When sentences are vague or their meaning is left open to interpretation then they are not clear and the discussion is therefore not clear.
- Consistency - does the discussion use consistent terminology and language? If different terms/language are/is used to talk about the same thing throughout the discussion then it is not consistent.
- Correctness - is the discussion (arguably) correct? If the claims in the discussion are not logically sound/reasonable or are not backed up by supporting evidence (citations), or otherwise are not commonly accepted, then they are not assumed to be correct.
- Conciseness - is the discussion expressed in the most concise way possible? If the content/meaning/understanding of the discussion can be effectively communicated with less words, then the discussion is not as concise as it could be. Each sentence in the discussion should be concisely expressed.
- Completeness - is the discussion completely covering what is required? If something is missing from the discussion that would have significant

impact on the content/meaning/understanding of what it conveys, then the discussion is incomplete.