Assignment 2 Marking Rubric | Semester 2 2020

	Mark/ Weight	HD+	HD	DI	CR	PA	PA-	NN
% of mark	**45 marks**	**100%**	**85%**	**75%**	**65%**	**55%**	**30%**	**0%**
Implementation (Milestone 2)	**15 marks 30%**	Outstanding	Complete and error free implementation of Milestone 2. Could have minor improvements to data representations and user interaction so to not be a HD+.	Complete implementation of Milestone 2, that (1) may contain minor logic errors or inconsistencies; (2) must not crash or segfault	Complete implementation of Milestone 2, that contains no more than one significant error, such as one cause of a crash or segfault.	Functional implementation of Milestone 2, that (1) is operational for common/typical use; (2) contains errors which are non-debilitating to the software	Incomplete or error ridden implementation of Milestone 2.	Not completed or of unsatisfactory quality.
			Fully implements all features as specified for Milestone 2.	Fully implements all features as specified for Milestone 2.	Implements a minimal version of all features specified for Milestone 2. Features require significant improvement to be considered ‘’fully” implemented	Implements a minimal version of the majority of features specified for the Milestone 2. Features require significant improvement to be considered ‘’fully” implemented.		
			Meets the minimum requirements in the use of data structures	Meets the minimum requirements in the use of data structures				
			Exceptional coding style and suitably documented code.	Good coding style and suitably documented code, that (1) contains minor style issues or inconsistencies; (2) does not use any banned elements.	Good coding style and suitably documented code. Some minor style issues or inconsistencies. Implementation does not use any banned elements.	Suitable coding style and suitably documented code, but code is confusing to comprehend without further explanation from the developers.	Poor, or messy coding style that is confusing to comprehend. Minimal documentation.	
	Milestone 1		Formed Group by M1 submission	Formed Group by M1 submission				
	Milestone 1		Milestone 1 rating of ‘ahead’ or ‘on-track’	Milestone 1 rating of ‘ahead’ or ‘on-track’	Milestone 1 rating of ‘ahead’ ‘on-track’, or ‘behind’	Any Milestone 1 rating	Any Milestone 1 rating	Any Milestone 1 rating
Test Cases	**5 marks 10%**	Outstanding	Excellent tests for Milestone 2 which (1) cover both common use cases and edge cases; (2) are well-designed; (3) clearly show the software is error free	Good tests for Milestone 2, that (1) cover the common use cases or edge cases; (2) are well-designed with clear consideration to the purpose of each test.	Sufficient tests for Milestone 2, that (1) cover common use cases; (2) may not be clear on their purpose, or poorly designed and overly complicated; (3) may contain minor errors.	Genuine attempt at writing tests for Milestone 2, that (1) cover common use cases; (2) may not be clear on their purpose, or poorly designed and overly complicated; (3) may contain minor errors.	Poor (or missing) Tests for Milestone 2.	
Analysis and Design (Milestone 4)	**5 marks 10%**	Outstanding	Excellent and well-established justification of (1) how the required data structures are used; (2) choices and design of the ADTs.	Good justification of (1) how the required data structures are used; (2) choices and design of the ADTs; however (3) may errors or gaps in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Good justification of (1) how the required data structures are used; (2) choices and design of the ADTs; however (3) may errors or gaps in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Minimal justification of (1) how the required data structures are used; (2) choices and design of the ADTs; however (3) contains multiple errors in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Poor justification of (1) how the required data structures are used; (2) choices and design of the ADTs; however (3) contains multiple errors in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Analysis is not conducted or of unsatisfactory quality
			Excellent Analysis of (1) the efficiency of the program; (2) consequence and trade-offs in the design of the program.	Good Analysis of (1) the efficiency of the program; (2) consequence and trade-offs in the design of the program; however (3) may errors or gaps in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Good Analysis of (1) the efficiency of the program; (2) consequence and trade-offs in the design of the program; however (3) may errors or gaps in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Minimal Analysis of (1) the efficiency of the program; (2) consequence and trade-offs in the design of the program; however (3) contains multiple errors in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Poor Analysis of (1) the efficiency of the program; (2) consequence and trade-offs in the design of the program; however (3) contains multiple errors in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	
			Excellent justification of the reasons for the tests that were contributed.	Good justification of the reasons for the tests that were contributed.	Good justification of the reasons for the tests that were contributed.	Minimal justification of the reasons for the tests that were contributed.	Poor justification of the reasons for the tests that were contributed.	
			Well written report and excellent demonstration, that (1) presents the above analysis; and (2) leaves few unanswered questions.	Well written report and good demonstration, that (1) presents the above analysis; and (2) leaves some unanswered questions.	Suitable report and demonstration, that presents some (but not all) of the above elements.	Report and demonstration presents some (but not all) of the above elements, with significant prompting from the markers to answer questions.	Report and demonstration are (1) poor, unclear, and confusing; (2) ill-prepared; (3) minimally presents the software; (4) requires multiple prompts from the markers.	Report and Demonstration is not conducted or of unsatisfactory quality.
Group Work & Ethical Software Development (Individual Marks may be awarded)	**5 marks 10%**	Outstanding	Excellent group participation for the entire duration of the assignment, such that (1) attends all group meetings if able; (2) contributes every week; (3) raises issues in a timely manner.	Good group participation for the entire duration of the assignment, such that (1) attends most group meetings if able; (2) contributes most weeks; (3) raises issues in a timely manner.	Good group participation, such that (1) attends most group meetings if able; (2) makes a sufficient contribution, but inconsistently each week; (3) raises issues in a timely manner.	Sufficient group participation, such that (1) makes a sufficient contribution to the group; (2) raises issues in a timely manner.	Minimal or token group participation. Does not raise issues in a timely manner.	Does not contribute to the group. Does not raise issues in a timely manner.
			Excellent group management, such that (1) the group’s progress is ‘*ahead*’ or ‘*on-track*’ every week; (2) tasks are delegated across the group.	Good group management, such that (1) the group’s progress is ‘*on-track*’ most weeks; (2) tasks are delegated across the group.	Good group management, such that (1) the group’s progress is ‘*on-track*’ or ‘*behind*’ every weeks; (2) tasks are delegated across the group.	Sufficient group management, such that (1) the group’s get the work done by the due date; (2) tasks are delegated across the group.	Poor group management, documentation, and delegation of tasks across the group.	
			Exceptional demonstration and adherence to the standards and practice of Professionalism and Ethics, such as described in the ACS Core Body of Knowledge (CBOK) for ICT Professionals.	Exceptional demonstration and adherence to the standards and practice of Professionalism and Ethics, such as described in the ACS Core Body of Knowledge (CBOK) for ICT Professionals.	Good demonstration and adherence to the standards and practice of Professionalism and Ethics, such as described in the ACS Core Body of Knowledge (CBOK) for ICT Professionals.	Sufficient demonstration and adherence to the standards and practice of Professionalism and Ethics, such as described in the ACS Core Body of Knowledge (CBOK) for ICT Professionals.	Violation of the standards and practice of Professionalism and Ethics, such as described in the ACS Core Body of Knowledge (CBOK) for ICT Professionals.	
Enhancements (Milestone 2)	**10 marks 30%**	Outstanding	Complete and error free implementation of (1) at least two major enhancements; (2) at least one minor enhancements.	Complete and error free implementation of (1) one major enhancements; (2) one minor enhancements.	Complete and error free implementation of (1) at least two minor enhancements.	Complete and error free implementation of (1) at least one minor enhancements.	Implementation of (1) at least one minor enhancements.	Not completed or of unsatisfactory quality.
			Fully implements the enhancement(s), such that it is a complete and fully functional aspect of the program.	Fully implements the enhancement(s), such that it is a complete and fully functional aspect of the program.	Fully implements the enhancement(s), such that it is a complete and fully functional aspect of the program.	Fully implements the enhancement, such that it is a complete and fully functional aspect of the program.	Minimal implementation of the enhancement.	
			Does not copy the work of other students in their group.	Does not copy the work of other students in their group.	Does not copy the work of other students in their group.	Does not copy the work of other students in their group.	Does not copy the work of other students in their group.	
			Style as per HD for Milestone 2	Style as per DN for Milestone 2	Style as per CR for Milestone 2	Style as per PS for Milestone 2	Style as per PA- for Milestone 2	
Analysis and Design (Milestone 3, individual component)	**5 marks 10%**		Excellent analysis and well-established justification of (1) choices and design of data structures and ADTs; (2) efficiency; (3) consequences and trade-offs	Good analysis and justification of (1) choices and design of data structures and ADTs; (2) efficiency; (3) consequences and trade-offs; however (4) may errors or gaps in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Good analysis and justification of (1) choices and design of data structures and ADTs; (2) efficiency; (3) consequences and trade-offs; however (4) may errors or gaps in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Minimal analysis and justification of (1) choices and design of data structures and ADTs; (2) efficiency; (3) consequences and trade-offs; however (4) contains multiple errors in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Poor analysis and justification of (1) choices and design of data structures and ADTs; (2) efficiency; (3) consequences and trade-offs; however (4) contains multiple errors in the analysis and/or justifications(s).	Analysis is not conducted or of unsatisfactory quality
			Well written report and excellent demonstration, that (1) presents the above analysis; and (2) leaves few unanswered questions.	Well written report and good demonstration, that (1) presents the above analysis; and (2) leaves some unanswered questions.	Suitable report and demonstration, that presents some (but not all) of the above elements.	Report and demonstration presents some (but not all) of the above elements, with significant prompting from the markers to answer questions.	Report and demonstration are (1) poor, unclear, and confusing; (2) ill-prepared; (3) minimally presents the software; (4) requires multiple prompts from the markers.	Report and Demonstration is not conducted or of unsatisfactory quality.