# COMP8860 Group Project – Feedback [Assignment 2] *Rogério de Lemos (February 2024)*

Students’ names/group name: G1

Class supervisors: Sergey Ovchinnik (S.Ovchinnik@kent.ac.uk) and Matthew Hibbin (M.Hibbin@kent.ac.uk)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Project** | **Marks Available** | | **Mark awarded** | **Comments** |
| **Group Organization**  Good organization and use of resources (allocation tasks, concurrent working, good use of all team members available). | Very Good | 6 | 4 | - Good change of priorities when prompted by customer feedback.  - Minutes were too similar to the customer diary. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Development process**  Well-motivated and documented (e.g., minutes, artefacts, logs) use of a development process. Any deviation from it well-explained and motivated. | Very Good | 6 | 4 | - Development process well defined and any exceptions explained.  - Minutes did not include any notes from the daily morning meetings that were stated. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Requirements (Solutions)**  Good analysis of problem. Clear and well documented choice of features. | Very good | 6 | 6 | - Good analysis of the problem and research into disabilities  - Clearly laid out choice of features |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Design and HCI**  Good use of user stories, test design/plan, UML diagrams (beyond), user interface. | Very good | 6 | 2 | - Good use of lofi prototypes and testing different designs.  - User stories aren’t well presented and acceptance criteria conflicts with writing in the report.  - The user interface of the splash screen is devoid of any accessibility options itself. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Implementation and Code**  Correctness of features implemented.  Good code structure, meaningful code comments, etc. | Very good | 6 | 4 | - Implemented features such as the TTS and font sizes are of good quality.  - Good comments but more would have been good to have.  - Implementation of the splash screen makes it redundant; it can’t be focused and doesn’t contain any settings to change before entering HEAT. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Project** | **Marks Available** | | **Mark awarded** | **Comments** |
| **Quality Assurance**  Well-motivated and documented use of QA techniques. These should include: well defined acceptance criteria, and well documented test planning, definition and evaluation. | Very good | 6 | 0 | - No formal QA or testing was carried out.  - The wiki section includes definitions and bullet points of how they were loosely followed.  - The definitions of testing are not matched by the actions undertaken. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Tools**  Good use of Git. Use of tools for debugging and testing, colour blind simulations, etc.). | Very good | 6 | 4 | - Good use of GitLab and other tools to develop the program.  - Issues were utilised but could have been used better i.e. closing all completed issues and leaving comments on open ones. |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |
| **Understanding & insight**  Reflection and awareness emerging from report. Lesson learned. | Very good | 6 | 6 | - Insight is nicely honest and identifies all the areas for improvement correctly and with detail |
| Good | 4 |
| So-so | 2 |
| Poor | 0 |

**Total : 30 / 48**

The mark of each member may be adjusted to account for **participation** to the project in case of uneven or no participation.