Please do not reply to this email. Contact your lecturer or demonstrator with any queries about your results.

Assignment 3

Second iteration: return(theJedi);

FIT2099 - Object-Oriented Design and Implementation - 1 - 2018

28305728 - LUHAN CHENG 28393414 - MARCUS KEN JIE OOI Your mark: **22.5/25.0 (90.00%)**

Task 1: Deliverables

This section is about the quality of your code and submitted documentation.

Task 1.1: Java code

Task 1.1.1: Functionality

This section covers the quality of the code you submitted. For full marks here, your implementation will need to be robust and stable. It must also meets specification.

Reservoirs start with 40 hitpoints	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
Force Ability - some actors can have it	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
If the hitpoints of a reservoir fall below 20, its short description changes to "a damaged water reservoir"	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
If the hitpoints of a reservoir fall below 20, its long description changes to "a damaged water reservoir, leaking slowly"	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
If the hitpoints of a reservoir fall below 20, its symbol changes to V	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
If the hitpoints of a reservoir fall to 0 or below, its short description changes to "the wreckage of a water reservoir"	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
If the hitpoints of a reservoir fall to 0 or below, its long description changes to "the wreckage of a water reservoir, surrounded by slightly damp soil"	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
If the hitpoints of a reservoir fall to 0 or below, its symbol changes to X	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A

After a Grenade is taken, it can be left using a no command, without exploding	ormal leave	☐ Poor ☐ Okay ☐ Good ☐ N/A
After a Grenade is taken, it can be thrown, causi explode	ng it to	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Entities in the location where the grenade is through hitpoints (NB. It is acceptable for this to be the solocation in which the actor that threw it is located	ame	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Entities in locations that can be reached in one s the location where the grenade is thrown lose 10	-	 □ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Entities in locations that can be reached in two s the location where the grenade is thrown lose 5	-	□ Poor □ Okay☑ Good □ N/A
The actor that throws the grenade is not affected	I	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
A sandcrawler moves in the same way as Ben Ke	nobi	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
A sandcrawler moves only moves every second to	ırn	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
If a sandcrawler finds a droid in its location, the taken inside the sandcrawler	droid is	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
A sandcrawler has a door that can be entered by with force ability	any actor	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
When the actor enters the sandcrawler, the actor the interior of the sandcrawler	moves to	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
The interior of the sandcrawler is a grid of at lea locations	st four	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
All the droids taken by the sandcrawler must be interior locations	in one of its	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
One of the sandcrawler interior locations has a door that can be used by any actor with force ability to return to the location in which the sandcrawler is located \square N/A		Okay □ Good
Task 1.1.1 Comment: The door for sandcrawler is missing. If the Luke owns a droid in the sandcrawler, the droid should follow luke. This way Luke can rescue droids.		
Mark for task 1.1.1: 7.0 out of 8.0		
Task 1.1.2: Style and readability		
Variable, attribute, and method names are well-chosen	□ Poor □ C N/A	kay ☑ Good □
Use of javadoc	□ Poor □ C N/A	okay ☑ Good □
Quality of comments	□ Poor □ C N/A	okay ☑ Good □
Readability (Layout, use of whitespace indentation etc.)	□ Poor ☑ C N/A	Okay □ Good □

Task 1.1.2 Comment: None

Mark for task 1.1.2: 2.5 out of 3.0 Mark for task 1.1: 9.5 out of 11.0

Mark for task 2.1: 4.0 out of 4.0

Task 1.2: Supporting documentation

If your design changed during implementation, e.g. because you needed to refactor or discovered that your initial design was unworkable, you needed to keep your documentation up to date. If not, there was no need to change the documentation.

Design documentation matches code	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
New documentation is readable	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Notation used (if any) is correct	\square Poor \square Okay \square Good \square N/A
Rationales provided for any refactorings	$\ \square$ Poor $\ \square$ Okay $\ \square$ Good $\ \square$ N/A
Spelling, grammar etc. of written documentation (if any) is correct Task 1.2 Comment: None Mark for task 1.2: 3.0 out of 4.0 Mark for task 1: 12.5 out of 15.0	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Task 2: Design quality	
Task 2.1: Design of new system componer. This section is about the design as embodied in the design as written in the documentation.	
Engine code is unchanged (i.e. classes under edu.monash.fit2099)	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Good use made of existing infrastructure (e.g. Actions, Affordances, Entities)	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Use of encapsulation (e.g. implementation hiding, us of private attributes)	se □ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Quality of abstractions (classes contain related data and functionality)	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Public interfaces are well-designed for new classes/packages	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Any refactorings improve quality of design	□ Poor □ Okay ☑ Good □ N/A
Task 2.1 Comment: None	

Task 2.2: Integration with existing system

The implementation makes appropriate use of the existing framework of actors, entities, actions, affordances, etc.

Task 2.2 Comment: Good

Mark for task 2.2: 4.0 out of 4.0 Mark for task 2: 8.0 out of 8.0

Task 3: Meeting submission requirements

Task 3.1: Use of Git and GitHub

Both partners used GitHub	□ No ☑ Yes
Frequency of commits	\square Just one \square A few \square Many
Quality of commit comments	s 🗆 None 🗆 Poor 🗹 Okay 🗆 Good
Task 3.1 Comment: None	
Mark for task 3.1: 2.0 out of	2.0
Task 3 Comment: None	

Mark for task 3: 2.0 out of 2.0

Task 4: Work allocation

This section is only used if teaching staff become aware that a teammate has significantly breached the Work Breakdown Agreement.

4.1: Work allocation bonus

If you have done significantly more work than is fair, you may receive compensation here.

Task 4.1 Comment:

Mark for task 4.1: None out of 20.0

4.2: Work allocation penalty

If you have done significantly less work than is fair, you may receive a penalty here.

Task 4.2 Comment:

Mark for task 4.2: None out of 25.0

Task 4 Comment: None

Mark for task 4: 0.0 out of 20.0

5: Late penalty

Late submissions are penalized at 10% per working day.

Task 5 Comment:

Mark for task 5: None out of 25.0

Total mark: **22.5/25.0 (90.00%)**