Statistical Computing: Coursework A marking

Finn Lindgren

4 February 2020

Marks are out of 50.

$\geq \mathbf{45}$: The code runs with no errors.
It correctly implements the tasks as requested.
It is well commented with input/output documentation for function definitions.
The style is good with consistent indenting and good variable name choices.
There is significant and creative investigation of the problem.
The investigation of the tasks is very well explained, presented, and is interesting.
Potentially could be used as a model answer.

$\mathbf{40 - 44}$: The code runs with no errors.
Its implementation of the tasks is mostly as requested.
It is generally well commented, with input/output documentation for function definitions.
The style is generally good with consistent indenting and good variable name choices.
There is significant investigation of the problem.
Generally well explained and presented investigation into the tasks.
Essentially only relatively minor issues.

$\mathbf{35 - 39}$: The code runs with no errors.
Its implementation of the tasks is mostly as requested, although possibly with some issues.
The commenting is ok but could be better, perhaps with comments or function documentation missing.
The style is generally good, perhaps with minor issues of indenting or variable name choices.
There is perhaps a good degree of investigation of the problem.
Occasional issues with presentation, but on the whole looks coherent and attractive.
Well explained investigation into the tasks, perhaps less interesting or occasionally less well explained in places.

$\mathbf{30 - 34}$: The code runs possibly producing errors, but ones of minor importance (i.e. an error is produced but most of the code works).
Its implementation of the task is mostly as requested, although possibly with some bigger issues.
The commenting and function documentation are perhaps largely missing.
The style is generally good, perhaps with minor issues of indenting or variable name choices.
There is perhaps some modest investigation of the problem, although perhaps investigating obvious questions.
At times the investigation is less well explained or consists of code with no explanation and the purpose has to be inferred.
Presentation may be lacking in places (poor figures, inconsistency of written text etc)

$\mathbf{25 - 29}$: The code runs possibly producing errors, but ones of minor importance (i.e. an error is produced but most of the code works).
Its implementation of the tasks is incomplete, but at least some working code is presented.
The commenting and functiion documentation are perhaps largely missing.
The style is ok, perhaps with some issues of indenting or variable name choices.
There is some investigation of the problem although perhaps at a rather basic level.
Explanation lacking detail more often, perhaps significant amounts of the investigation where the ideas and purpose behind code is left without explanation and these have to be inferred.
Perhaps some more major issues with the presentation of project, poor figures, inconsistent presentation of results in different parts, inconsistent use of markdown etc.

$\mathbf{20-24}$: Code possibly produces more major errors, or would produce several errors.
Implementation of the tasks is lacking, major elements of the tasks misunderstood or not implemented in code properly, perhaps all the tasks attempted but none correctly.
Perhaps no comment lines or function documentation.
Possibly poor style. Lacking or very minimal investigation of the problem.
Explanation of investigation is generally quite weak and perhaps absent.
Perhaps quite poor presentationally.

$\mathbf{15-19}$: Poor answer.
Demonstrates major imperfections in understanding of the tasks/programming.
Code would produce perhaps several errors.
Probably no comment lines or function documentation.
Probably poor style.
Lacking or very minimal investigation of the problem.
Explanation of investigation is poor or absent.
Probably quite poor in presentation.

$<\mathbf{15}$: Very poor answer.
Little understanding demonstrated.
Implementation of the tasks is severely lacking, either by misinterpretation of the tasks or by misunderstanding how to implement them in code.
No comment lines or function documentation.
Poor style.
Code does not work, would produce several errors when run.
Lacking investigation of the problem.
Very minimal or absent explanation of the investigation of the tasks.
Poor presentation.