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 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: Congjia Chen

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 organisation and code are generally very neat and logically structured.
3. Your Git repo size when I checked week 7 was about 5 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 the way lost parts of your git history – but we don't check these possibilities!
4. You have included both overall and week-specific readme files. These are comprehensive and well-organised, and you have included things like dependencies for each one. 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. Your docstrings are exemplary, and your commenting is generally both informative and not excessive. Lovely work!
6. Excellent job with the coding overall. Commendable attention to detail, exemplary documentation, and error-free!
7. Your Python is generally very modular – this is excellent as this is how Python is meant to be!
8. 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. Although your file organisation is generally excellent, some of your script outputs (e.g. TAutoCorr.pdf) have been saved to your Week3/code/ subdirectory, rather than placed into the relevant results subdirectory. This is messy, and could make it hard for you and/or users of your code to find things within your project structure, particularly when it comes to more complex projects.

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

1. In your readmes you included some note to the language and dependencies requirements, but could stand to include versions used as well. 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.

2. You had a .gitignore, which is good! In future, particularly for more complex projects, you may choose to also exclude different files or types of files in different subdirectories. For more details on how far you can go with this you will likely find this useful: `https://www.gitignore.io`.

2 Overall Assessment

A thoroughly impressive job overall. Clean and excellently documented code. You have built a very strong base upon which to continue your development as a programmer!

Provisional Mark: 88%

Signed: Alexander Kier Christensen & Samraat Pawar

March 23, 2022