# COMP8860 Group Project – Feedback [Assignment 2] *Rogério de Lemos (February 2025)*

Students’ names/group name: G3

Class supervisors: Sergey Ovchinnik (so362@kent.ac.uk) and Sophie Rogers (sr652@kent.ac.uk)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Project** | **Marks Available** | | **Mark awarded** | **Comments** |
| **Group Organization**  Good organization and use of resources (allocation tasks, concurrent working, good use of all team members available). | Very Good | 6 | 6 | Clear distribution of tasks between team members, each member has made a significant contribution to the project. Evidence of pair programming provided. Good use of branches for concurrent development. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Development process**  Well-motivated and documented (e.g., minutes, artefacts, logs) use of a development process. Any deviation from it well-explained and motivated. | Very Good | 6 | 6 | Minutes of daily stand-up meetings provided. Very good use of the issue tracker, milestones, and the GitLab’s burndown chart feature. The choice of development methodology is well motivated and reflected upon. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Requirements (Solutions)**  Good analysis of problem. Clear and well documented choice of features. | Very good | 6 | 6 | User stories are clearly outlined through the GitLab issues and grouped into milestones. Acceptance criteria provided for each story. Evidence of background research provided. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Design and HCI**  Good use of user stories, test design/plan, UML diagrams (beyond), user interface. | Very good | 6 | 2 | Design of the interface changes is presented somewhat minimally. Evidence of Figma use is shown but only the splash screen design stages are documented in the corpus. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Implementation and Code**  Correctness of features implemented.  Good code structure, meaningful code comments, etc. | Very good | 6 | 6 | Good code structure, new features are integrated well into the existing codebase. Features work as intended with no major issues. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Project** | **Marks Available** | | **Mark awarded** | **Comments** |
| **Quality Assurance**  Well-motivated and documented use of QA techniques. These should include: well defined acceptance criteria, and well documented test planning, definition and evaluation. | Very good | 6 | 4 | Good use of functional and unit testing though some additional documentation of these tests would be nice to have in the corpus. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Tools**  Good use of Git. Use of tools for debugging and testing, colour blind simulations, etc.). | Very good | 6 | 6 | Tools used in the project are well documented. IDEs, Figma, GitLab features, freesound, etc. are documented and justified. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Understanding & insight**  Reflection and awareness emerging from report. Lesson learned. | Very good | 6 | 6 | Deep and insightful reflection provided in the report. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |

**Total : 42 / 48**

The mark of each member may be adjusted to account for **participation** to the project in case of uneven or no participation.