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: Natasha Ramsden

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 very neat and well organised, well done.
3. Your Git repo size when we checked week 7 was about 128 MB. This is not truly excessive but it is quite large! Be sure to suppress unnecessary files, and beware excessive commits!
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. Nice work! 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 had a .gitignore throughout, with meaningful exclusions specific to certain weeks. Good! You can fine tune the exclusions further for future projects if you wish, for which you will likely find this useful: `https://www.gitignore.io`.
6. You have generally made an effort to write modular Python code where appropriate. This is good Pythonic practise and worth practising as much as possible!
7. Excellent job with the coding overall. Good attention to detail, judicious error handling/catching, thorough commenting/documentation, no meaningful errors, and minimal warnings.
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. None!

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

1. Although your commenting was generally very good, one file (`TAutoCorr.R`) strangely had no comments at all.

2 Overall Assessment

Overall an excellent set of work. Your code reads clearly, runs without errors and is well documented (with that one exception!). You have clearly built a strong foundation upon which to progress as a programmer. Well done!

Provisional Mark: 97%

Signed: Alexander Kier Christensen & Samraat Pawar

March 23, 2022