# CSC2058 Peer Assessment 2 For EcoJozi Group number 22.

This Assessment Document is intended to provide you and your assessor with an overview of each group member’s involvement in delivering the final components of the CSC2058 Project.

Each group should complete one Peer Assessment 2 Document **and its content must be agreed by all group members**. The completed form should be included at the start of your group’s PDF report. ***Don’t forget to fill in the Group Number.***

There are three main parts to the Assessment Document – the Evaluation, the Declaration and the Personal Statements (**spaces for each team member’s personal statement are provided at the end of this document**). All parts must be completed – otherwise your group’s report will not be marked. Arrange a group meeting to discuss the evaluation and personal statements, **and please carefully read the note on the following page**!

**This evaluation concerns work that was undertaken and completed during the Second Semester.**

**Team members are expected to maintain a high level of engagement with the project across both semesters.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation** | Group Number: | | | |
| Name | Contribution to team-working and motivation1 | Contribution to  the Poster and the Poster Video, PDF Report 2, and the Final Game Demo Video and Game Demo Schedule 1,2 | Contribution to methodically developed and functioning  game code 1,2 | **Peer Score**  (Range 85 – 115)  **You must fill this in as well as the other columns.** |
| *Muneer Alsahli* | *4* | *3* | *1* | *90* |
| *Adan Khan* |  |  |  |  |
| *Hassan Sakka* |  |  |  |  |
| *Ryan O'Neill-Quinn* |  |  |  |  |
| *Hein Htet Aung,* |  |  |  |  |
| *Joshua Dennison* |  |  |  |  |
| *Clive Nyamadzawo* |  |  |  |  |

1Values for contribution: 1 = Minimal Contribution; 2 = Reasonable Contribution; 3 = Good Contribution; 4 = Very Good Contribution;  
 5 = Excellent Contribution

2This value should consider contributions in the round – direct contributions this semester to required deliverables, and contributions this semester that have made the deliverables possible.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Declaration**  “I declare that I have read the Queen's University regulations on plagiarism, and that any contribution I have made to the attached submission is my own original work, except for any elements that I have clearly attributed to third parties. I understand that this submission will be subject to an electronic test for plagiarism and will also be subject to the University’s regulations concerning late submission if it is received after the deadline.” | | |
| Name | Date | Confirmation *(use the words shown in the example below!)* |
| *Muneer Alsahli* | *21/03/2025* | *I agree to the terms of the declaration* |
| *Adan Khan* | *21/03/2025* | *I agree to the terms of the declaration* |
| *Hassan Sakka* | *21/03/2025* | *I agree to the terms of the declaration* |
| *Ryan O'Neill-Quinn* | *21/03/2025* | *I agree to the terms of the declaration* |
| *Hein Htet Aung,* | *21/03/2025* | *I agree to the terms of the declaration* |
| *Joshua Dennison* | *21/03/2025* | *I agree to the terms of the declaration* |
| *Clive Nyamadzawo* | *21/03/2025* | *I agree to the terms of the declaration* |

***A note on the Evaluation:***

Complete all the columns in the Evaluation Table, **including the Peer Score column**. The Contribution columns are intended to help team members quantify each other’s input to the project, before they award agreed **Peer Scores**. There will not necessarily be a precise correlation between the Peer Score and the Contribution values. However, high Contribution values, as an indicator of the importance of the team member’s work to the success of the project, should normally result in a high Peer Score for a team member. Likewise a low Peer Score would be the expected outcome if Contribution values are low. Students who have made a high-value Contribution in all three contribution categories (e.g. 5,5,5) should expect to receive a higher Peer Score than students who have made a lower-value Contribution in one or more categories (e.g. 5,5,3).

If, having reviewed the Contribution values, the team agrees that Team Member 1 made an ‘only just adequate’ contribution overall, a Peer Score of 85 would be appropriate for Team Member 1. If Team Member 1’s contribution was excellent (critical to the success of the project in all areas of engagement), consider a peer score of 115. If Team Member 1 made a generally good contribution, doing what was expected of them, they could expect to receive a Peer Score of 100. It may be that a team member (for whatever reason) has disengaged from the project entirely, and in such circumstances **a Peer Score of 0** may be acceptable. ***Please inform the Module Lecturer if a team member has left your group or has ceased to play an active role in the group.***

**P.T.O.**

Each team member’s overall score for the Semester 2 deliverable will be calculated according to the following formula, where S*i* is Team Member *i*’s overall score, P*i* is the Peer Score received by Team Member *i*, N is the number of members in the team, and M is the raw mark awarded to the Semester 2 deliverable by the assessor.

**Except for a Peer Score of 0, a Peer Score must not be awarded to a Team Member who has not made any clearly identified contribution to the Semester 2 deliverable.** Peer Scores **outside** the range 85 – 115 should be discussed with the Module Lecturer. Provided there are appropriate and clearly identified contributions by the Team Member, a Peer Score within the range 85 – 115 will normally be accepted by the Module Lecturer. **However, students are expected to award a range of Peer Scores within a team: it is very unusual in a project for everyone to display exactly the same level of ability and commitment, and the Peer Scores should reflect this. (See the following paragraph also!)** Be fair: be prepared to recognise someone who has adopted a leading role in the project, and acknowledge the fact that some contributions will be weaker than others. Uniform scores may require that the Team discuss its decision with the Module Lecturer, in order to agree a fair distribution of scores. Throughout the project, team members should use appropriately named folders in GitLab to help them co-ordinate their work and maintain a record of their contributions.

**Where team members cannot agree a distribution of Peer Scores, or the distribution is unreasonable, the Module Lecturer’s judgement will be final.** In such circumstances the Lecturer will normally consider: individual contributions to the module, as evidenced by uploads to GitLab; minutes of meetings that name attendees and document the progress of their work; sections of the PDF report that clearly identify lead and secondary contributors; the personal statements in this document; other relevant evidence. **If your team is unable to agree a distribution of Peer Scores, please inform the Module Lecturer before you make your final submissions.**

**All team members should ensure that their contributions are clearly identifiable in the Git record and in the content of the PDF report** (e.g. – in the PDF report – [heading:] ‘Class Diagram: Principal: A.B; C.D; Support: E.F.; G.H.; I.J.; K.L.)’.

**Each team member is expected to be actively involved in all aspects of the development process, even if they take a primary or leading role for some components and a secondary or supporting role for others.** A leading role might mean that you identify candidate classes, attributes and operations for the class diagram, complete the first draft of the class diagram, and approve the final version; a supporting role might mean that you review the class diagram and prepare corrections and additions, or that you provide the written commentary on the diagram, having consulted with the lead designer.

**Taking the agreed Contribution values and Peer Scores into account, each team member must enter a personal statement in one of the boxes on the following pages.**

**Personal Statements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Personal statement of (enter name):* | *Muneer Alsahli* |
| The following were my most significant contributions to the Semester 2 Deliverable (100 words or less): | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Personal statement of (enter name):* | *Adan Khan* |
| The following were my most significant contributions to the Semester 2 Deliverable (100 words or less): | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Personal statement of (enter name):* | *Hassan Sakka* |
| The following were my most significant contributions to the Semester 2 Deliverable (100 words or less): | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Personal statement of (enter name):* | *Ryan O’Neill-Quinn* |
| The following were my most significant contributions to the Semester 2 Deliverable (100 words or less): | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Personal statement of (enter name):* | *Hein Htet Aung* |
| The following were my most significant contributions to the Semester 2 Deliverable (100 words or less): | |
|  | |

**Personal Statements (continued)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Personal statement of (enter name):* | *Joshua Dennison* |
| The following were my most significant contributions to the Semester 2 Deliverable (100 words or less): | |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Personal statement of (enter name):* | *Clive Nyamadzawo* |
| The following were my most significant contributions to the Semester 2 Deliverable (100 words or less): | |
|  | |

# User Interface Design: (10%)

1. Overview of the user interface:
2. Sample Prompts
3. Sample Messages
4. Status Summaries
5. Written Commentary
6. Visual Examples (for the GUI)

Structure of the user interface design section:

1. Introduction to the user interface:
2. Sample Prompts:
3. Sample Messages:
4. Status Summarises:
5. Visual Examples:

# Class Diagram: (10%)

# Implementation Related Documentation: (10%)

1. Acceptance test plan
2. Automated Testing (Junit)

# Adherence to Process: (10%)

1. Evidence of adherence to process
2. Appendix 1: Team minutes:
3. Appendix 2: Credits for the poster:
4. Appendix 3: Credits for the poster video:
5. Appendix 4: Credits for the final game demo video:
6. Appendix 5: Development process comments:
7. Appendix 6: GitLab Evidence:
8. Appendix 7: JUnite testing evidence:
9. Appendix 8: Security and assurance considerations:
10. Appendix 9: Third party software
11. Appendix 10: Updated use cases(optional):
12. Structure of the adherence to process section
13. Introduction to adherence to process:
14. Appendices: