**School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science**

**University of Bradford**

**Software Engineering with Group Project – Client Assessment**

**Team no 13**

Client (20%): completeness & error-free, usability, overall usage: **10**

Supervisor (60%):

(1) Requirements document (accurate content, adequate layout) (10)

(2) Code quality (clean architecture, comments, layout) (8)

(3) Functionality (completeness against the requirements document) (17)

(4) Processes (GitLab use, commits) (5)

(5) Testing (Unit, System & Acceptance testing) (10)

(6) Working as a team (minutes; meeting attendance and contribution) (10)

***Client*  10 (20)**

Product completeness and correctness (are all the requested functions correctly implemented; if not how much has been implemented)

Comments.

- basic database development to date;

- interfaces include the login page and  CV upload with no working solution;

- some advanced interface features, including some attempt to optimise for mobile web browsing

**Client mark = 19/40**

***Supervisor***

(1) Requirements (10): 3

Requirements document looks outdated and very incomplete – this is similar to Project 1 rather than Project 2 about Placements.

(2) Code quality (8): 8

The code is clear, nicely formatted and naming conventions have been used. It usually has comments, but no author names are given in the files.

(3) Code functionality (17): 12

Requirements partially implemented; good quality code:

(4) Processes (5): 1

Repository layout was not adhered to – source files were uploaded outside of the Software directory. Commit messages do not systematically reflect the work uploaded. No regular commits were made – huge gaps are present i.e. March 19, April 12. No Kanban board or any task allocation is visible. No clear collaboration model, no Pull Requests, Issues, Wiki pages or branching strategy.

(5) testing (5+5): 1

**Unit testing: 0/5**

No unit tests found. Acceptance testing is in fact a set of screenshots!! 1

(6) Working as a team (10): 7

**Minutes:**  The meeting notes for all weeks are available. Attendance is given, location/date are not provided. Individual progress, team progress are not provided. Individual task allocation is given, but poorly described in some minutes. **Mark: 7/10**

**Total = 10+3+8+12+1+1+7=42**

**Khayiam Younas 16008113:** attended most of the team meetings; according to the minutes, not been able to complete his tasks in several instances;

**Mohammed Ismail 16008211:** missed several team meetings in the second half; according to the minutes no clear programming task carried out:

**Dawood Shahzad Khan 16011851:** attended most of the meetings; according to the minutes evidence of contribution to project’s technical aspects;

**Sheikh Mohammed Kashim Miah 14013095:** no attendance, no evidence of any contribution, the student should take **RESIT**

**Raja Kashif Ali 16009190:** attended most of the meetings; according to the minutes evidence of contribution to project’s technical aspects

**Soban Ahmed 16014217:** attended most of the meetings; according to the minutes evidence of contribution to project’s technical aspects

**Project 1**

**Team mark: 14.2**

**Individual marks: 14.2**

**Total Team = 56 (In the previous email, the total for project 2 was wrongly calculated, 40 instead of 42; consequently the new overall total is 56 instead of 54 and the individual marks are also updated accordingly)**

**Individual marks: DSK=RKA=SA=56; KY=MI=52; SMKM=38**