CS-230 Software Engineering
Marking & Feedback Sheet – Assignment A2 – Group Mark

Group	SE Group 05

Tick the prompts and use these in deciding a mark (a percentage range, e.g., 60-69) for each category.

Column key: bad fail (0-30), fail (30-39), 3rd (40-49), 2ii (50-59), 2i (60-69), 1st (70-85), good 1st (85-100)

Partial Implementation & Application Documentation & Video Demo (55%)

	bad fail (0-30)	fail (30-39)	3rd (40-49)	2ii (50-59)	2i (60-69)	1st (70-85)	good 1st (85-100)		Impl & Doc & Demo:
No or few features implemented						X		All features implemented including extras (20)	**50 / 55**
General feature functionality very low quality					X			General feature functionality of exceedingly high quality (15)	
Coding conventions never respected						X		Perfect coding style and comments (10)	
Javadoc not completed						X		Flawless Javadoc (10)	

What went well: This is an excellent program – well done! All features implemented and demonstrated – your extra features are very nice (lost item, validation of date, licence key). Your Javadoc is excellent and you have followed very good coding conventions throughout.

How to improve: It was not clear that copies had their own loan durations. You should not allow users to build up a balance i.e. pay more than they owe. Occasionally your code is not so easy to read – remember to leave an appropriate amount of white space. There are a few places where the summary sentence is missing from the Javadoc.

Minutes (10%)

	bad fail (0-30)	fail (30-39)	3rd (40-49)	2ii (50-59)	2i (60-69)	1st (70-85)	good 1st (85-100)		Minutes:
No or poor reflection about last week's goals				X				Good reflection of last week's goals (3)	**8 / 10**
Lack or excess detail of minutes				X				Perfect level of detail of minutes (3)	
Poor goals set for next week					X			Feasible & Detailed goals set for next week (3)	
No date of next meeting						X		Date of next meeting set (1)	

What went well: Contributions were explained, absences noted, tasks were allocated, problems discussed and decisions were noted.

How to improve: Each week reference to "all group members" is made, however the actual name of each person present is required. Although a day and time is specified for the next meeting, the specific date and time would be more useful – sufficient information was present to deduce this however. Formatting could have been improved, e.g. using highlighted sub-headings.

Report Format & Contributions (5%)

	bad fail (0-30)	fail (30-39)	3rd (40-49)	2ii (50-59)	2i (60-69)	1st (70-85)	good 1st (85-100)		Contributions Report:
Incorrect file format or filename						X		Correct file format and filename (1)	**4 / 5**
Member's Contributions unclear				X				Member's Contributions clearly identified (4)	

Overall

General comments (e.g., weak/strong points): RE: Report Format & Contributions: Plenty of detail available on individual contributions. I could identify who completed the minutes and who completed the video. As individual contributions do mention unexpected issues such as sicknesses etc., being unable to code due to technical problems, underestimating the code quality of others and the amount of work necessary; a section dedicated to unexpected issues may have improved the report. Individuals also noted extra methods and changes which could be considered design changes, a summary explaining these at the end of the report would also have been useful. Although the report format was clean and consistent, it would have benefited from page numbering.

Overall a very good project with a very good score.

Overall mark (should be a combination of marks above; explain your combination if different from the recommendation): The overall mark has been calculate using the above weightings. Note: This mark does not include the individual viva component mark (30%).	**Overall Group Mark:** **62 / 70**