Peer Code Review of Assessment Task 1

Following Assessment Tasks 1, 2 and 3 you will be required to complete a peer code review of assignment submissions by your classmates. This document gives some guidance on how to assess your peers work on the assessment criteria provided. This document also gives the criteria by which your peer code review will be assessed.

Guidelines for Applying Assessment Task 1 Criteria

Encapsulation of data and appropriate access methods:

The Sensor Class should:

- Keep all member data private
- Have a constructor that sets valid default values for sensor parameters
- Have public method(s) available to set configurable parameters (setters)
- Have public method(s) available to query all fixed and configurable parameters (getters)
- Have public method(s) available to retrieve sensor data, returning an array to the calling code
- Validate any configurable values supplied as arguments to setters and use valid defaults otherwise
- Indicate to the calling code whether the values supplied as arguments to setters are valid (eg. return a bool)

Proper code execution

The program should:

- Compile successfully
- Display the fixed parameters of the sensor
- Allow the user to specify values for the configurable parameters
- Not allow the user to specify invalid values
- Poll the sensor for data displaying each response on screen at the appropriate rate and within the appropriate range of values

Modularity

The sensor class should be written such that it could be used without modification by another developer to configure and get data from the sensor in their own program without needing to replicate logic or data from your main function. The sensor class should:

- Have a header file (*.h OR *.hpp) for the class declaration, separate to the file containing the main function
- Have a *.cpp file for the class definition, separate to the header and the file containing the main function
- Not interact directly with the console
- Implement all functionality specific to the sensor internally (eg. delay when polled for data)

The main function should:

- Implement console interaction/user interface.
- Not “hardcode” any sensor specific data but instead query the sensor class for this information
- Implement a loop which polls the sensor class for data repeatedly and store the resulting data in an array
- Print data returned from the returned array on the screen

Assessment Criteria for the Peer Code Review – Assessment Task 4 – Part 1 of 3

Assessment Task 4, Peer Code Review has a weighting of 9% in the overall assessment of this course. Your peer code review of Assessment Task 1 will contribute to 3 of these 9 points. The Assessment criteria is explained below:

1. Evaluates the submissions, broadly identifies submission correctness as per criteria (0.66 per correct evaluation). (2 points)
2. Provides feedback on improving submission, 0.33 points for meaningful feedback per submission. (1 point)
3. Reflects on own work and identifies potential improvements from reviewed submissions or correctly justifies why own work need not be improved from interaction with reviewed submissions (0 points)