

G54DIA Coursework 1 Assessment Guidelines

Assessment Criteria

The aim of the first coursework is to demonstrate your understanding of the relationship between task environment and the architecture of a single agent. To do well, a student must not only develop an agent that works well, but demonstrate that they understand why the agent works well. Marking is therefore based on:

- the capabilities of the implemented agent, including the quality of the specification, design and implementation;
- the degree to which the specification, design and implementation are clearly documented in the report, including any relevant background material used in the design and implementation of the agent; and
- clarity of presentation in general (including grammar, spelling and punctuation).

Extra credit will be given for submissions that demonstrate a clear understanding of the relationship between the specified task environment and the architecture of the implemented agent.

The following guidelines outline the typical requirements of specific grades for the software and report. It is not necessary that a report exhibit all the criteria listed in each grade given below to fall within that grade. The characteristics of each grade are merely representative of that grade, and the balance between various aspects of the work will be considered during assessment. Normally, the final report should not exceed 5,000 words excluding references.

Grades

- *Exceptional (90-100%)* The work and report should exhibit all the characteristics of an Outstanding grade. Additionally the report should be publishable without significant reworking or alteration. The software should be of the highest possible quality. The work should display the highest levels of originality in its design, implementation and analysis.
- *Outstanding (80-89%)* The work and report should exhibit all the characteristics of an Excellent grade. Additionally the results should be publishable in a suitably modified form. The software should be of the highest possible quality. The work should exhibit a high degree of independent thought and originality. Assistance from the module convener would have been minimal and the student would have exhibited high levels of self motivation.
- *Excellent (70-79%)* The work and report should display a complete and thorough understanding of agent design. There should be evidence of independent thought in the form of some degree of originality in the design and analysis of the software and presentation the results. The software should be complete in all respects and exhibit very high quality. The report should be well structured with a clear line of argument and the quality of the analysis should be excellent.

- *Good* (60-69%) The work and report should show a good understanding of agent design. The software should be complete, illustrate the principles of the approach adopted, and be of good quality. The report should be clearly structured, but there is no specific requirement for any degree of original work in the design or analysis. The quality of the analysis and the writing of the report should be good.
- *Average* (50-59%) The work report would be expected to display an adequate understanding of agent design, although weakness may be present in some areas. The software should be adequate to illustrate the design approach adopted, but it may display weakness in areas not central to the work. The report should contain evidence of some attempt to construct an argument for the design approach adopted. The analytical content and writing should be average.
- *Adequate* (40-49%) The work and report would display an incomplete understanding of agent design. The software would be poorly designed, incomplete and/or difficult to understand, and be of generally poor quality. The report would lack a clear structure and strong argument and the quality of analysis would be below average. The writing would be mediocre.
- *Poor* (below 40%) The work report would display a very poor understanding of agent design. Software would be limited in capability and buggy. The report would have no clear structure and the analysis may be weak or incomplete. The report would be poorly written and presented.