

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: Lizzie Bru

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 code is generally well organised and logically structured.
3. Your Git repo size when I checked week 7 was about 3 MB – nicely 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, as well as one within each week. The Readmes were clear, and comprehensive, even including info like dependencies and language version numbers. Good job! 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.
5. You have generally modularised your Python code where it made sense to do so. Modularised code is good Python practise! Good job remembering all the docstrings and having only one error in all of your Python code.
6. Excellent job with the coding overall, reasonably commented with only one very minor syntax error and minimal warnings.
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. `align_seqs.py` throws an error due to a missing hashtag at the start of the shebang.
2. You have some extraneous latex-related files (`FirstExample.aux/.log/.pdf`) in your `Week7/code` subdirectory.

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

1. 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>.

2 Overall Assessment

Excellent job overall. Clean, nearly error-free and well documented code. You should now have a very strong basis for future programming projects and development.

Provisional Mark: 82%

Signed: Alexander Kier Christensen & Samraat Pawar

March 23, 2022