Team Java Demonstration and Report

Project Assessment Form 2010/11
School of Computer Science
The University of Birmingham

Team: B3   Members: Daniel Cecil, Jere Ketonen, David Saunders, and Michal Staniaszek

Supervisor: Errol

Assessors: Errol

This form will be made available to the student.

The tickboxes are intended to provide information to students and reviewers. They are not used to mechanically compute the project mark. Some items are for completion by the supervisor or second assessor only.

Type of project: **... Space Runner**

QUALITY OF DEMONSTRATION (based on demonstration)

Positive	Rating (☐=empty, ■=selected)	Negative
Project introduced clearly and at the right level	☐☐☐☐☐■☐☐☐☐	No introduction at all
Key points conveyed clearly and logically	☐☐☐■☐☐☐☐☐☐	Muddled and/or incomprehensible
Effective use of appropriate demonstrations	☐☐☐■☐☐☐☐☐☐	Little or no use of appropriate demonstrations
Questions handled well	☐☐■☐☐☐☐☐☐☐	Unable to answer questions convincingly
All team members introduced and participated	☐☐☐☐☐■☐☐☐☐	Dominated by one team member with others ignored
Team processes highlighted	☐☐☐☐■☐☐☐☐☐	No mention of team processes
Team members clearly talked of their own responsibility	☐☐☐☐☐☐■☐☐☐	Team members struggled to talk about their own areas of responsibility

Comments on DEMONSTRATION (not covered by questions above)

Presentation did not appear to be planned.

Claimed to use incremental development

Michal ran demo.

QUALITY OF SOFTWARE (based on demonstration, design description, and code review)[1]

Positive criterion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Negative criterion
Software performed without errors [2]		■								Software failed to run
Code using meaningful variable names throughout		■								Code applies no standards to variable naming
Code uses a reasonable class structure and function code size		■								Code has no structure – uses one class
Internal documentation used consistently (i.e. JavaDoc)				■						No internal comments exist
Unit tests used for most code (Junit or use of Main test method)					■					No unit tests available or documented
A comprehensive testing strategy has been used and documented						■				No testing strategy is documented
Design documentation clear and agrees with code	■									No design documentation is provided
Reasoning for design decisions provided					■					No design reasoning is provided
Network structure and protocols documented			■							Network structure and protocol is not documented

Comments on SOFTWARE (not covered by questions above)

JUnit tests wouldn't compile.

Game ran but after playing a game, wouldn't go to a new game.

So you never developed a testing strategy to ensure that everything worked!!

A good test analyst has no knowledge of the code but an excellent understanding of the requirements. You seem to be saying that they need a better knowledge of the code than the programmers.

QUALITY OF ENGINEERING PRACTICES (based on description and repository review)[3]

Positive criterion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Negative criterion
Project well researched with good reference to existing work							■		Little or no evidence of consideration of relevant existing work
Clear evidence of the application of engineering practices						■			Poor or no evidence of good engineering practices
Clear evidence of evaluation and adaptation of standard practices				■					Poor or no evidence of evaluation and adaptation of practices
Clear evidence of evaluation of practices used							■		Poor or no evidence of evaluation of practices used

Comments on ENGINEERING PRACTICES(not covered by questions above)

No external references on software engineering practices.

Practices not compared with any external references

Critique of using JUnit but no attempt to verify critique against reported cases of its use and application.

---

1   This relates to the software column of the Assessment Criteria
2   Each band represents on of the mark bands as documented in the Assessment Criteria. The first three relate to a 1st grade, the fourth to a 2:1 grade, the fifth to a 2:2 grade, the sixth to a 3rd grade, the seventh to a marginal fail, and the last two to the lower two fail categories.
3   This relates to the Engineering Practices column of the Assessment Criteria

QUALITY OF TEAM WORK (based on description, work logs / breakdown, and demonstrator report)[4]

Left	Scale	Right
Clear evidence of implementation of a team management strategy	☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Poor or no evidence of a team management strategy
Evidence of team cooperation or the resolving of issues	☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Poor or no evidence of team cooperation or the resolving of issues
Clear evidence of evaluating team practices and identification of improvements	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐	Poor or no evidence of evaluating team practices
Clear evidence of allocation of work evenly amongst team members	☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	No evidence of work being allocated evenly amongst team members
Clear recognition of strengths and weaknesses in the team in allocation of work	☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	No recognition of strengths and weaknesses in the team in allocation of work

Comments on TEAM WORK (not covered by questions above)

Facebook and email used for communication

Only two working on coding at the end? What happened?

QUALITY OF REPORT[5]

Left	Scale	Right
Shows clear formulation of the requirements	☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	No or very limited formulation of the requirements
Key design and implementation decisions clearly set out and justified	☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Account of decisions unclear and/or unjustified
Shows careful critical evaluation of *all* the work undertaken	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐	Little of no critical evaluation
Good use of English, fluently written	☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Poor use of English, clumsily written
Overall organisation excellent, with all required sections, including figures / tables as appropriate	☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Poor organisation, sections missing
Appendices or other evidence of technical achievements (e.g. reqs def'n, design, testing)	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐	No technical evidence of software engineering achievements
Correct use of references	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■	Incorrect or no referencing

Comments on REPORT (not covered by questions above)

What does the Attributes table tell me? Requirements need some expansion so that it is clear what is involved.

Introduction to Design chapter reads like notes to yourselves.

No references used

Repetition in the report makes it boring. Avoid it.

Evaluation should be based on data and not simply opinions.

---

4   This relates to the Team Work column of the Assessment Criteria
5   This reflects the standard of reporting that is expected in any project course.

SUBSTANTIALNESS OF ACHIEVEMENT[6]

Total amount of work done is excellent for level/credit value of the project	☐☐■☐☐☐☐	Inadequate amount of work done
Project shows thoroughness and is excellent attention to detail	☐☐☐■☐☐☐	Project shows carelessness and insufficient attention to detail
Complexity excellent for the level / credit value of project	☐☐■☐☐☐☐	Project is too simple for the level / credit value
Project shows flair, imagination and/or original thinking	☐☐☐■☐☐☐	Project is routine and unimaginative

Comments on SUBSTANTIALNESS (not covered by questions above)

---

6 This reflects an assessment of whether the team achieved a suitable level of work. **Note:** There is no explicit penalty for exceeding what might be reasonably expected in the time constraints of the course.

QUALITY OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION (based on work logs and demonstrator report)[7]

Left	Scale	Right
Fully participated in all aspects of the project	☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Never participated or stayed on the edge of the project
Attended all meetings and involved in all discussions	☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Attended no or few meetings and never joined discussions
Worked to resolve team difficulties	☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Instigator of team difficulties and showed a lack of willingness to resolve difficulties
Willingly helped others to understand project goals and to contribute to the success of the project	☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Provided no assistance to others or did the work of others without consultation
Clear evidence of individual effort and tasks completed	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐	No evidence of individual effort or tasks completed

Comments on INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION (not covered by questions above)

No hours recorded.

Some indications of having worked with rest of group

QUALITY OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION (based on work logs and demonstrator report)

Left	Scale	Right
Fully participated in all aspects of the project	☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Never participated or stayed on the edge of the project
Attended all meetings and involved in all discussions	☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Attended no or few meetings and never joined discussions
Worked to resolve team difficulties	☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Instigator of team difficulties and showed a lack of willingness to resolve difficulties
Willingly helped others to understand project goals and to contribute to the success of the project	☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Provided no assistance to others or did the work of others without consultation
Clear evidence of individual effort and tasks completed	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐	No evidence of individual effort or tasks completed

Comments on INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION (not covered by questions above)

Away for last four weeks

No hours in personal log

---

7   This relates to the Individual Practices column of the Assessment Criteria. Each student is assessed individually with respect to this criteria.

Student: David Saunders

QUALITY OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION (based on work logs and demonstrator report)

	Scale	
Fully participated in all aspects of the project	☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Never participated or stayed on the edge of the project
Attended all meetings and involved in all discussions	■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Attended no or few meetings and never joined discussions
Worked to resolve team difficulties	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Instigator of team difficulties and showed a lack of willingness to resolve difficulties
Willingly helped others to understand project goals and to contribute to the success of the project	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Provided no assistance to others or did the work of others without consultation
Clear evidence of individual effort and tasks completed	☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	No evidence of individual effort or tasks completed

Comments on INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION (not covered by questions above)

Log finishes at week 8.

Hours slightly on the light side.

Primary focus seems to be projectiles

Student: Michal Staniaszek

QUALITY OF INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION (based on work logs and demonstrator report)

	Scale	
Fully participated in all aspects of the project	■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Never participated or stayed on the edge of the project
Attended all meetings and involved in all discussions	☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Attended no or few meetings and never joined discussions
Worked to resolve team difficulties	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Instigator of team difficulties and showed a lack of willingness to resolve difficulties
Willingly helped others to understand project goals and to contribute to the success of the project	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Provided no assistance to others or did the work of others without consultation
Clear evidence of individual effort and tasks completed	■ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	No evidence of individual effort or tasks completed

Comments on INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION (not covered by questions above)

Hours tending to be more than is required