

CLO 13: Apply empirical techniques to assess and report the performance of one or more algorithms.

To use: decide if student meets pass criteria (if not award 0, optionally circle reason), on pass decide next if 2 is deserved instead of 1

Criteria	1 Point Acceptable (PASS CRITERIA)	0 Points Fail	2 Points Strong	Score (0-2)
Technical				
1. Follow study plan Section 2.6	<input type="checkbox"/> Most steps clearly identifiable, evidence of reading section	<input type="checkbox"/> Not clear if plan was followed or little evidence of reading section	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly followed plan with strong evidence of section material study	
2. Purpose (goal)	<input type="checkbox"/> Wordy but mostly <u>in line with problem</u> requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> Generic, confused or no statement, or not in line with problem	<input type="checkbox"/> Concise, clearly stated to reflect <u>specific</u> problem requirements	
3. Choice of efficiency metric	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Correct</u> choice with general or confused justification	<input type="checkbox"/> Incorrect choice or no justification	<input type="checkbox"/> Best choice <u>for problem</u> with clear justification	
4. Design and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Clear, representative</u> inputs sampling leading to reliable data with <u>some</u> discussion of characteristics	<input type="checkbox"/> Unclear, bad, or inadequate sampling leading to questionable data, <u>or no discussion</u> of design	<input type="checkbox"/> Thoughtful sampling, clear discussion of characteristics, procedures, design choices and consequences for <u>specific</u> problem	
5. Discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, mostly sound discussion of <u>good data</u> (required), or flawed data but identified and explained, or flaws in comparison with theory	<input type="checkbox"/> Confused, generic, very little or no discussion, or no comparison to theory, or <u>bad data</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, <u>concise</u> presentation of findings based on good data with insightful remarks and sound comparison to theory	
6. Conclusions	<input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable conclusions based on experiment results (even if bad student may recognize so)	<input type="checkbox"/> Missing, poor, or flawed conclusions, or <u>not in line</u> with results	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear summary of results and well <u>justified</u> final decisions	
Submission (double points)				
7. Follow instructions	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 minor violations, <u>some</u> evidence of reading project assignment	<input type="checkbox"/> Too many violations, poor or no evidence of reading project assignment, or <u>late submission</u> (*)	<input type="checkbox"/> No violations of assignment rules and specifications (<u>an easy 4 points</u>)	
Report				
8. Organization and clarity	<input type="checkbox"/> Organized report with understandable writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized report, very poor or barely understandable writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Neat, organized report with clear writing and basic sentence structure	
9. Originality and effort	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual effort can be identified	<input type="checkbox"/> Little evidence of individual effort, or some identifiable copying	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly <u>distinct</u> effort, <u>even if weak</u> , reflecting individual work	

*Scoring Guide • A:18-19, B:16-17, C:14-15, D:12-13, F:11 (min mark) • 20 Distinction • Late Submission Max: 16(B)