

CE320 2022-2023 Coursework (Iteration 2)

STUDENT: JORDAN, NATHAN LUKE

LOGON ID: nj19061

REGISTRATION NUMBER: 1905341

GROUP: Group 10

PEER EVALUATION

Participated in group discussions or meetings: 4.331481 (#6 out of 81)

Helped keep the group focused on the task: 4.570827 (#3 out of 81)

Contributed useful ideas: 4.538210 (#2 out of 81)

Quantity of work done: 4.615973 (#4 out of 81)

Quality of work done: 4.433231 (#6 out of 81)

Average score: 4.497944 (#3 out of 81)

Rating	Interpretation
5	Outstanding
4	Above Average
3	Average
2	Below average
1	Weak
0	None

Contribution to Final Mark: 22.5% (avg score x 5)

TA EVALUATION

Effective use of Subversion: 4.255000 (#13 out of 81)

Effective use of Trac: 4.810000 (#2 out of 81)

Use of Unit Testing and TDD: 4.900000 (#1 out of 81)

Use of pair programming: 4.275000 (#15 out of 81)

Quantity of work done: 4.550000 (#2 out of 81)

Quality of work done: 4.315000 (#7 out of 81)

Average score: 4.520000 (#2 out of 81)

5	Outstanding
4	Above Average
3	Average
2	Below average
1	Weak
0	Extremely bad or no competence shown

Contribution to Final Mark: 33.9% (avg score x 7.5)

Feedback: Your activity and number of commits reveals that your grade in using of Subversion and Trac is good. Therefore, your contribution is also marked as good. Pair programming mark would be good (There are more than 10 signs of collaboration with team members). These are ChoosyApplication.java, Main.java, Calendar.java and etc. Your contribution toward the TDD and unit testing is good since you have committed to CalendarTest.java, DateButtonTest.java and couple of more files. The quantity of work you have done is good since you have committed to the development of the above-mentioned files. The quality of work is good since you have followed the principles of abstraction and encapsulation in your design and implementation. / Very good use of project wiki page to outline user stories and regular updates. Good use of Trac platform to manage development activities. Lots of code files dumped in sandbox, should have modified existing codebase and pushed back in main branch. Didn't involve in as much pair programming as it needed to be should paired up with each team member at least once for code development task. Effectively used Unit Testing and did TDD for his core development tasks. Major contributor in development related tasks. Good coding practices followed, code is readable and comprehensible. Lots of code refactoring done.

MODULE SUPERVISOR EVALUATION OF GROUP

Degree to which the group generated value for the project's customers: 4.5

Degree to which the group delivered the planned features and stories: 4.3

Effective use of Subversion: 3.8

Effective use of Trac: 4.1

Use of Unit Testing and TDD: 4.1

Use of pair programming: 3.5

Quantity of work done: 4.0

Quality of work done: 4.0

Average score: 4.0375

Ratings	Mark Range	Interpretation
4.5-5.0	80-100%	Outstanding
4.0-4.5	70-80%	Very good
3.0-4.0	60-70%	Good but with some limitations
2.0-3.0	50-60%	OK but with significant limitations
1.5-2.0	40-50%	Weak, but above pass level
1.0-1.5	30-40%	Some work done but too weak for pass
0.0-1.0	0-30%	Extremely bad or no work done

Contribution to Final Mark: 30.3%

(avg score x 7.5 if peer score > 1, 0 otherwise)

Group Feedback: Excellent value for the customers and delivery of stories/features. Very good use of subversion (including referring to tickets), but many 'solo' commits (no driver/navigator) and also 3 out of the 8 members of the group committed anything substantial. Generally excellent use of trac. Pity once again that that was dominated by a subset of the group. Excellent unit testing although only by the usual trio. Pair programming only done by three members on a third of the commits. Great quantity and quality of work done, but unfortunately mostly done by a small subset of the team. Your team did well (there has only been a small contraction of the mark w.r.t. iteration 1). However, it has not really fully embraced XP in the sense that the three to programmers left everyone else behind, rather than trying to involve the rest of the team.

FINAL (provisional) MARK: 86.7 (#1 out of 81)

