

## Labs and Project Grading

### Penalty for incomplete submission:

Failing to submit the code and/or report by the set deadline, without prior approval, will result in **a zero mark for the task**, even if it is successfully implemented and demonstrated during the lab sessions.

### Implementation Mark:

To achieve 100% in this category, it is essential to successfully implement all task requirements. Additionally, supervision during lab and QA sessions must convincingly demonstrate student's full understanding of the implementation and sole authorship of the code.

### Implementation Mark Scaling

To avoid the below penalties on the implementation mark, the student must demonstrate convincingly his/her (practically) sole authorship of the implementation by answering all related questions about the code, algorithm, and the concepts covered in the lab task. This includes providing clear evidence of incremental design and implementation as observed during the lab session and through the GitHub repository.

### Penalties

- **Code sharing (in the range of 25%):** Lab session supervision and QA session demonstrate convincingly student's full understanding of the implementation and large authorship of the code. Clear sign of incremental design and implementation as observed during the lab session. However, the submitted code shows evidence of partial code sharing<sup>1</sup> between the students.
- **Shallow understanding (in the range of 30%):** Lab session supervision and QA session demonstrate convincingly student's overall understanding of the implementation and partial authorship of the code; however, the student doesn't provide clear answers to all questions.
- **Code sourced from a third-party tool with full understanding (50%):** QA session demonstrates a full understanding of the implementation with clear evidence of extensive use of a third-party tool as acknowledged by the student and/or observed during the lab sessions and/or flagged by Turn it-in.
- **Code source from a third-party tool with poor understanding (100%):** very poor explanation of the implementation with clear evidence of sourcing the code from a third party. No evidence of incremental design and implementation during the lab session.
- **Penalties for inadequate comments:** 10% for a very poor commented code and 5% for an unsatisfactory one.

**Please note that the above penalties are provided as guidelines; the lab supervisor can adjust them as deemed necessary.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Sharing, but not verbatim copying. The latter constitutes an alleged assessment malpractice which can be investigated formally.