**Assessed Coursework**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course Name** | **Systems Programming H** | | | |
| **Coursework Number** | **AE1b** | | | |
| **Deadline** | **Time:** | **4:30** | **Date:** | **12 November 2020** |
| **% Contribution to final course mark** | **2%** | | | |
| **Solo or Group ✓** | **Solo** | **** | **Group** |  |
| **Anticipated Hours** | **4** | | | |
| **Submission Instructions** | **As specified in Aropa.** | | | |
| **Please Note: This Coursework cannot be Re-Done** | | | | |

**Code of Assessment Rules for Coursework Submission**

Deadlines for the submission of coursework which is to be formally assessed will be published in course documentation, and work which is submitted later than the deadline will be subject to penalty as set out below.

The primary grade and secondary band awarded for coursework which is submitted after the published deadline will be calculated as follows:

1. in respect of work submitted not more than five working days after the deadline
   1. the work will be assessed in the usual way;
   2. the primary grade and secondary band so determined will then be reduced by two secondary bands for each working day (or part of a working day) the work was submitted late.
2. work submitted more than five working days after the deadline will be awarded Grade H.

Penalties for late submission of coursework will not be imposed if good cause is established for the late submission. You should submit documents supporting good cause via MyCampus.

**Penalty for non-adherence to Submission Instructions is 2 bands**

**You must complete an “Own Work” form via**

[**https://studentltc.dcs.gla.ac.uk/**](https://studentltc.dcs.gla.ac.uk/) **for all coursework  
UNLESS submitted via Moodle**

Peer Code Review:

Web Monitoring

# Requirement

Code review is widely practiced to improve code quality. This exercise gives you experience of the process, and provides timely feedback to you and to your peers.

The quality of the reviews is critical. You should aim to follow the code review and marking guidelines carefully to provide an accurate assessment, and aim to provide informative comments where appropriate.

# Specification

Two other students’ assignments will be been randomly and anonymously allocated to you for review using the Aropa tool. If you have submitted BST solution, you will review BST solutions. If you have submitted an AVL solution, you will review AVL solutions.

Available on Moodle is a model solution and example input, test code, and output files.

You can revise your reviews before the deadline. If you don’t (for any reason) submit an assignment you can still do the reviews – but you must email Phil to ask him to put you on the reviewing list!

It is important that the comments you make, and marks you award accurate, and hence consistent with those awarded by a second and third reviewer. I will check that the reviews are consistent for every assignment. If one or both your reviews are inaccurate you will lose marks.

Detailed review and marking guidelines are provided on Aropa. Selecting the Radio buttons determines the marks awarded, and the comments are about justifying why you select a specific button. As part of the review you are expected to compile and link the submitted code, run it against test inputs, and compare the results with expected output.

# Marking Scheme

Your submission will be marked on a 30 point scale as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Description |
| 15 | 10 marks for accurate review of 1st student submission that is consistent with second review, and with moderator.  5 marks for informative comments. |
| 15 | 10 marks for accurate review of 2nd student submission that is consistent with second review, and with moderator.  5 marks for informative comments. |