

# Marking Scheme for AILP Assignment 2

Stuart Anderson

13 Dec 2015

This is the marking scheme I will use for the main submission and we can use it to structure the discussion for the demo sessions. This means the demo sessions can involve discussing both the operation of your code and the structure and content of your report. This part of the practical is worth 42% of the overall marks for the course. The practical will be marked on **six** equally weighted elements. Each element will be graded on a six point scale (this means the overall mark will be out of 30 and this will be scaled and rounded to a mark out of 42):

Mark	Meaning	Explanation: code	Explanation: report
0	Missing	This is missing from the submission	This part is missing from the report.
1	Poor	The element is present but unsatisfactory	This part of the report is present but it fails to provide an overall outline of the material it is supposed to report on.
2	Fair	The element is present in a barely passable form.	This part of the report is present but it has serious omissions or inaccuracies.
3	Good	The element is present and is good but may have a number of significant flaws	This part of the report is present and it provides a good overview of the material but contains a significant number of small inaccuracies, omissions or misconceptions.
4	Very good	The element is present but it may have a small number of flaws.	The section of the report is present but it may have a small number of inaccuracies, omissions and misconceptions.
5	Excellent	The element is present and generally works apart from some minor flaws.	This part of the report is present and provides a comprehensive description at an appropriate level of detail given the overall size of the report.

Recall from the Assignment 2 text, that the emphasis of the grading in Assignment 2 will be on the report. The grading on Assignment 1 rested entirely on the design, coding, test and documentation of your solution - this plays a smaller role in Assignment 2. Also note that your report should cover aspects of the work done in Assignment 1 where this is necessary to understand your work in Assignment 2.

<b>Element</b>	<b>Description</b>
Code: Operation	Your code will be tested by following the README on a DICE machine running Scientific Linux 6. Your README should be detailed enough to allow your code to be tested easily and you should supply details of how to interpret any demo script you give.
Code: Quality	This is for the quality of your code in terms of structure, robustness and the extent to which the functions it offers meet the specification in Assignment 2
Report: Overview and Design	This is for the quality of the work on describing the argumentation system and how your work has handled the notion of burden of proof..
Report: Implementation	This is for the quality of your report on how you went about implementing your design. This is not a reiteration of the code but rather a high level description of what your implementation was aiming to achieve and how you achieved that goal.
Report: Evaluation	This is for the quality of the work you did to evaluate your system. This should describe how your system tackles the issue of Burden of Proof.
Report: Conclusion and Overall Structure	This is for the quality of the conclusions your draw in terms of how well they are supported by your work and the literature. This will be considered together with the overall structure of the report and the quality of the bibliography etc..