Software Engineering G6046

Group coursework feedback and marking sheet

Team number	5
Marked by	Dr Kingsley Sage
Submission status	Complete
Were any additional files/resources sent other than by Canvas?	Video by YouTube link https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCfA_oAs-qoOGMWJ_UueYHng GitHub docs at: https://minosaji.github.io/Software-Engineering-Project/
Team allocation correct as recorded on Canvas?	Yes
Any ghost members?	No
If YES, which student(s)?	-
Peer review received?	Yes
Is peer review in dispute?	No
If YES, what action taken?	-
Video included in submission?	Yes
Is there a working prototype?	Yes
Other notes/comments/observations	-

Mark grid (refer to refined grading criteria document)

Element	Max marks	Marks awarded
Planning docs	5	4
Planning – meeting notes	5	3
Process documentation (sprint documents)	10	7
High level design	5	5
Low level design	5	5
Software documentation	5	4
Testing	10	7
Code	50	37
Group report	5	5
Team score basis (see below for individual mark allocations)	100	77

Narrative feedback

Overall a solid effort. Your group report gives a helpful insight into your overall experience. You make some really good observations, such as making you that you finish off one sprint and its documentation before starting another, and seeing the impact that a "less than ideal" decision upfront can have later on – your misunderstanding of property buy and sell mechanics being the case in point. But all of this stuff is useful learning experience and I think you likely learned much from this project. There is certainly a sense of a team at work and a genuine attempt to purse this project as an Agile process.

You had a total of 4 sprints and your sprint documents give a good sense of choosing tasks in a rationale manner. There is plenty of evidence of planning and active risk management.

But I really liked with this project was the Sphinx themed on line documentation. This provides a decent blend of broad high and low level documentation in a really useable form. This is exactly the sort of documentation that a future developer would value trying to take this project further forwards. You could have put rather more into code level documentation – that is rather sparse – but the online documentation does compensate for that.

You have a working AI player – you embraced that at the outset. OK it was more challenging to get the AI player to make "smart" moves but that is something that future development could enhance, working on the solid foundation you built here.

I would say the video are a bit of a sensory overload – maybe have an option to mute the music!! I can see evidence of some unit testing (could be more comprehensive) and some decent system level testing.

So overall this is consistent with what your customer was looking for (with some earplugs in …). There is a little more to do, but the quality documentation has added a good deal wo you score here and shows a real effort to run this as a proper Software Engineering project.

Individual mark allocations

Candidate Number	**Team**	**Team Score** (Out of 100)	**Peer Assessment** From team	**Team score** (Scaled)	**Peer Assessment** (Adjusted)	**Final mark**
Baker, Stuart	5	77	20	68	10	78
Chen, Owen	5	77	20	68	10	78
Hein, Lin	5	77	20	68	10	78
Law, Duncan	5	77	20	68	10	78
Shi, Eric	5	77	20	68	10	78
			100			