## Graded Unit assessment: learner assessment record

### Learner name Brodie Harkins Learner number

**Class**  HDCSD-BF22B  **Group**

### Stage 2 — Developing

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evidence Requirements** | **Record of Performance** | | |
|  | **Marks** | | **Comments** |
| **Title of task — Development** | **Max** | **Actual** |
| **Inception phase planning** |  | | |
| **Production of application**    Coding of the problem domain      Coding of the UI domain  Use of unfamiliar libraries and/or constructs  Error handling      Internal documentation | 25 | 3  3  4  3  5  Total  18 | Code structure is overall good, with appropriate use of inheritance, getters, setters, scope, constructors. However, some elements of the design are not fully implemented: there are issues with adding players, particularly creation of duplicates.  The screens and flow are in line with the design. The separation of responsibilities between View and Model is well handled, with business logic located in the Model and data passed appropriately between the two. Events are handled appropriately. Input validation is poor, and could have been improved by better user feedback and clearing of data.  Unfamiliar UI elements are used appropriately, as are enumerated types within the code. Research into unfamiliar constructs and elements is well documented in portfolio  Basic exception handling is implemented, with good use of multiple catch statements. At least one exception thrown by the Model is handled in the View. An exception is thrown from a View class, but this does not appear to be handled within the application, so would result in an unhandled exception. UI validation is good on blank input, but valid input is not validated  Internal documentation all good |
| **Testing**    Test plan  Test runs | 10 | 5  4  Total:  9 | A good strategy which discusses unit testing as well as final testing. Good test coverages and good specification of inputs and outputs  Evidence of running the tests once, and good documentation of evaluation and steps to correct. HOwever, the test run is not dated and no documentation of having retested after changes. |
| **Documentation**    User documentation | 5 | 5 | Good user documentation, thorough portfolio to support submission |
| **Total marks** **for developing** | **40** | 32 |  |
| **Overall comments**    **Grade for this stage: 80%**  **A very good implementation supported with excellent documention** |  | | |
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