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Lab Teacher: Larry Wen

1 Project Management

Project Planning

Time Schedule

[This table should show who completed each task, the estimated time for each task, and the

actual time spent.]

# Task Student Planed Time Actual Time Cumulative Time Finish

Date

1 Make project plan Tom 2 hours 2.5 hours 2.5 hour 01/08/2025

2 Meeting Everyone 1 hour 1 hour 02/08/2025

Group Meeting Records

[Group meetings are a critical component of effective project collaboration. You must

document each meeting, specifying the date, time, attendees, and whether it was conducted

online or face-to-face. Additionally, provide details of any software tools used to manage the

project.]

# Meeting Topics Attendance Loc Software Date and

Time

Comments

1 Introduce each

other.

Everyone Online Teams 1pm to 2pm

02/08/2025

We have decided that Tom

would be the team leader, and

Jerry will responsible to create

the GitHub repository

Effort Summary

Student Name (#Id) Planed hours Actual hours

Total working hours:

Average working hours per person

Peer Review

Purpose

The peer review process in OOSD is designed to promote collaborative learning, develop

feedback skills, and encourage shared responsibility in team-based projects. It helps

students reflect on their own contributions, evaluate team dynamics, and engage in

transparent, constructive dialogue for continuous improvement.

Instructions

The peer review form is to be completed and submitted at the end of each project milestone

(Milestone 1, Milestone 2, and the Final Milestone). It is structured into three sections:

• Section 1: Self-Review – A reflection on one’s own role and contributions during the

milestone.

• Section 2: Peer Review – Constructive evaluation of each team member’s

performance, completed individually for every teammate (excluding oneself).

• Section 3: Self-Reflection – A critical reflection on the feedback received from peers,

focusing on its relevance and impact on individual learning and improvement.

Note: Every team member, including the team leader, must complete Sections 1, 2, and 3

individually and include them in the report. The team leader is also responsible for

summarizing the results in the Peer Review Summary Table.

Section 1 – Self-Review [your name]

Please answer the following questions to reflect on your own role and contribution during

this milestone.

1. What was your primary role in this milestone?

(e.g., front-end developer, tester, documentation lead)

2. What specific tasks or deliverables did you complete?

(Provide clear examples of your work.)

3. What challenges, if any, did you face while contributing to the project?

(e.g., technical issues, time constraints, coordination etc.)

4. What is one aspect of your contribution that you would like to improve in the next

milestone?

5. On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate your overall contribution to the team?

(1 = very poor, 10 = excellent)

Section 2 – Peer Review (One per Team Member)

Instructions:

This section must be completed once for each of your team members, excluding yourself.

Please replicate the peer review questionnaire below and complete it separately for each

individual in your group. You are required to review all other members of your group

individually.

For instance, in a team of four students, each member is expected to submit three individual

peer reviews one for each teammate.

Ensure your responses are constructive, evidence-based, and respectful. Your feedback should

aim to support your peers' development and contribute to a fair and reflective team

environment.

Reviewee Name:

1. What was this team member’s main role during this milestone?

(State the key responsibility assigned to them.)

2. What were their key contributions?

(Mention both the quantity and quality of their completed work.)

3. How would you evaluate their professionalism?

(Consider teamwork, responsiveness, reliability, and communication etc.)

4. What is one respectful and specific suggestion for how they could improve in

the next phase?

5. On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate their overall contribution to the

team? (1 = minimal contribution, 10 = outstanding contribution)

Note: After completing the peer review process, team members are expected to share the

written feedback with each reviewee. This step ensures that all students have the opportunity

to reflect on the feedback received, promoting open communication and continuous

improvement within the team.

Section 3 – Self -Reflection

Please reflect on your learning and team experience during this milestone.

1. Was the peer review process fair and helpful in identifying your contributions

and role within the team?

(Explain your experience. Was it clear, balanced, and accurate in reflecting what you did?)

2. Did the feedback you received help you identify any areas for personal or team

improvement?

(Explain one insight or takeaway from the feedback shared by your teammates.)

3. On a scale of 1 to 10, how useful was this peer review cycle for your learning and

team development?

(1 = Not useful at all, 10 = Extremely useful)

4. How did you respond to the feedback you received from your peers?

(Did you agree with it? Did it lead you to change anything in how you approached the

project?)

Peer Rating Summary Table

This table is used to consolidate peer review scores for each team member. Upon completing

all individual peer reviews, the peer rating scores should be entered into the summary table as

follows:

• Each row represents a student who has provided peer review scores (reviewer).

• Each column represents a student who has received peer review scores (reviewee).

• A numerical score between 0 and 10 should be entered to reflect the reviewer’s

assessment of the reviewee’s overall contribution during the milestone.

• Self-ratings are not permitted; students must not evaluate their own performance.

All scores entered should be consistent with the corresponding written evaluations completed

in Section 2. This summary table facilitates the calculation of average peer review scores and

supports further analysis by the teaching team.

Reviewer/Reviewee Member 1 Member 2 Member 3 Member 4 Member 5

Member 1 - 10 10 10 10

Member 2 10 - 10 10 10

Member 3 10 10 - 10 10

Member 4 10 10 10 - 10

Member 5 10 10 10 10 -

Total Score 40 40 40 40 40

Average Score 10 10 10 10 10

Score Adjustment Table

Based on individual student’s average review score, the student’s mark would be adjusted

based on the table below.

% Difference from Group Avg Score Adjustment

Over 50% above/below Instructor discretion

40–50% above +10%

21–40% above +8%

11–20% above +5%

±10% No change

11–20% below –10%

21–40% below –20%

40–50% below –30%

2 Requirement Analysis

Functional Requirements (FR)

List and describe functional requirements demonstrated in the Milestone 1 demo video.

Non-Functional Requirements (NFR)

Provide at least one NFR for each of URPS categories.

Use Case Diagram

Insert use case diagram.

Activity Diagram

Insert activity diagram from Start New Game to End Game.

3 Implementation

GitHub

[Provide the link to your GitHub repository and confirm the lab teacher has access.]

GitHub Link:

Screenshot of Commit History: (Insert image here)

GitHub Advanced

Screenshot of Pull Requests: (Insert image here)

Screenshot of code review: (Insert image here)

Screenshot of tags: (Insert image here)

File Structure

Provide screenshot of GitHub repository structure (IntelliJ with Maven).

Coding Snippets

Provide code snippets (with explanation) demonstrating:

• JavaFX

• Enhanced for loop

• Enhanced switch

• Interface usage

• Abstract class usage

• Record type usage

4 Demonstration

Demo Video Link

Provide the link to your demo video hosted on a public platform (e.g., YouTube).

Video Link: