**CS-230 Software Engineering  
Marking & Feedback Sheet – Assignment A2 – Group Mark**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Group | CS Group 38 |

Tick the prompts and use these in deciding a mark (a percentage range, e.g., 60-69) for each category.

good 1st (85-100)

1st (70-85)

2i (60-69)

2ii (50-59)

3rd (40-49)

fail (30-39)

bad fail (0-30)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partial Implementation & Application Documentation & Video Demo (55%)** | | | | | | | | | |
| No or few features implemented |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | All features implemented including extras (20) | **Impl & Doc & Demo**:  **40 / 55** |
| General feature functionality very low quality |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | General feature functionality of exceedingly high quality (15) |
| Coding conventions never respected |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | Perfect coding style and comments (10) |
| Javadoc not completed |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | Flawless Javadoc (10) |
| **What went well:** Your video demonstrates your product and most of the functionality. Overall, both your code and Javadoc was a high quality. | | | | | | | | | |
| **How to improve:** Your video fails to demonstrate a few features such as optional data, fines being generated upon the return of late items. Your transaction history is also missing required data. Please follow submission instructions (do not use rar). In terms of code quality, there were a few issues with constants/variables being name incorrectly, in some areas encapsulation was violated, and some data was not encapsulated properly. In terms of Javadoc, there are few areas that could have been improved: some of your Javadoc used incorrect syntax e.g., @param/@return, and you did not use full sentences in some places. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Minutes (10%)** | | | | | | | | | |
| No or poor reflection about last week’s goals |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | Good reflection of last week’s goals (3) | **Minutes**:  **8 / 10** |
| Lack or excess detail of minutes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | Perfect level of detail of minutes (3) |
| Poor goals set for next week |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | Feasible & Detailed goals set for next week (3) |
| No date of next meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | Date of next meeting set (1) |
| **What went well:** Date and time for the current and next meeting, aims, discussion with some progress were all present. Formatting was consistent. Most aims had people allocated. | | | | | | | | | |
| **How to improve:** Attendees and absentees should have been clearly listed at the top of each week’s minutes. Separate sections for progress, discussion and decisions would have been helpful. It would have been interesting to have brief minutes extensions for the extra 3 meetings alluded to. The body of the minutes would have been easier to read if it was broken into bullet points or sentences separated by white space, i.e. generally having some highlighted headings and perhaps adding a ‘contents’ at the top too. Also, I did not see where the decision was made to evenly divide the resources – ideally this would be clearly stated in week one. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Report Format & Contributions (5%)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Incorrect file format or filename |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | Correct file format and filename (1) | **Contributions Report:**  **4 / 5** |
| Member’s Contributions unclear |  |  |  |  | X |  |  | Member’s Contributions clearly identified (4) |
| **Overall** | | | | | | | | | |
| **General comments (e.g., weak/strong points):** RE: Report Format & Contributions: I was able to determine who worked on the video but not who worked on compiling the contribution report or the minutes. The format of the report was clean and tidy but sections summarising challenges or design changes were noticeably absent especially considering individual reports did touch on some issues. Individual contributions appeared to be sufficiently detailed and added to a reasonably long report, but two blank pages appended technically exceeded the specification (and were not marked). Page numbering and adding highlighting with consistent spacing under headings in some way would have approved the overall appearance of the report.  Overall this was a good project and you have done well achieving an overall 1st class group mark. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Overall mark (should be a combination of marks above; explain your combination if different from the recommendation):** The overall mark has been calculate using the above weightings.  Note: This mark does not include the individual viva component mark (30%). | | | | | | | | | **Overall Group Mark:**  **52 / 70** |