Grades

Print

Add to ePortfolio

Grade Item	Points	Grade	Comments and Assessments
Assignment 1	7.25 / 8	90.63 %	Overall Feedback Good Job! Pseudo Code Written (0.5 marks): Full marks: "Your pseudo-code is well-structured and reflects the logical steps of the algorithm" Stable Match Generated (4 marks): Full marks: "The stable match produced is correct and meets the requirements of the problem." Stability Checker (2 marks): Full marks: "The stability checker accurately identifies whether the matching is stable or unstable." Printing Number of Proposals (1 mark): Partial marks: "The number of proposals is printed, but there are some incorrect cases." (-0.25 marks) Implementation (0.5 marks): Partial marks: "Your implementation has some deviations from the lecture material, which impacts

			the time complexity" used the index() method to get the preference rankings inside the algorithm loop. (-0.5 marks)
Assignment 2	8 / 8	100 %	Overall Feedback Great work! Your solution correctly implements the greedy algorithm, maximizing non-overlapping jobs, with efficient code and proper input/output formatting. The documentation is clear, and the thorough test cases show an excellent understanding of the problem.
Midterm	21 / 30	70 %	
Assignment 3	2.75 / 8	34.38 %	Overall Feedback I. Correctness of Algorithm: 1.75/7 1.Identifying Interleavings (1 point) Perfect Marks (0.5/1): Identifies only cases which are false. 2. Computing the Correct Count of Interleavings (3 points) - (0.25) Count not printed 3. Printing the Correct Substrings (3 points) - (0) Didn't print any substrings Additional +1 point added for the written code. II. Documentation: 1/1 Clear pseudocode, complexity analysis and provided all naming conventions are perfectly followed.
Final exam	18 / 45	40 %	