COMP1605: DETAILED FEEDBACK with MARKS

Section for which mark is awarded:	*Marks*	*Marks given*
Task 1) System's Functional Requirements: ➔ System Requirements: A working system using OO design principle, and programming. Addressed all the functional requirements as specified inside the description of Task 1 above. Quality of the code. Design Documentation: ➔ ERD ➔ Class Diagram	**40**	**34**
Task 2) System's Functional Requirements: ➔ System Requirements: Successful integration of new type of payment method (standing order). Documentation: ➔ A list of files that you needed to change to incorporate ➔ Screenshot of the code segments which were added or manipulated to achieve this. ➔ A discussion of pros and cons of your followed approach. Reflect if there could have been any better approach. If yes, how?	**10**	**8**
Task 3) System's Functional Requirements: ➔ System Requirements: Successful integration of new type of operations [mobile phone top-up] involving the accounts. Documentation: ➔ A list of files that you needed to change to incorporate ➔ Screenshot of the code segments which were added or manipulated to achieve this. ➔ A discussion of pros and cons of your followed approach. Reflect if there could have been any better approach. If yes, how?	**10**	**8**
Task 4) System's Functional Requirements: ➔ System Requirements: Successful integration of joint account creation provision, and also a new 'view' adoption. Documentation: ➔ A list of files that you needed to change to incorporate	**15**	**11**

➔ Screenshot of the code segments which were added or manipulated to achieve this. ➔ A discussion of pros and cons of your followed approach. Reflect if there could have been any better approach. If yes, how?		
Task 5) ➔ The overall system's class diagram after incorporating Task 2, 3 and 4. ➔ Justification of the design pattern and frameworks used [if any] ➔ Overall critical reflection. If good OO principles have been followed? Comparative discussion among various approaches that might be undertaken, and the justification of your own adopted approach. The precision, correctness and depth of the discussion will be evaluated. Completeness of the report (documentation of all the Tasks 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of coursework have been completed), and presentation, consistency and coherence, and academic standard of the writing. Grammar, spelling, proof-read quality, and appropriate referencing: The references are expected to include authoritative and credible sources such as peer reviewed publications, government publications, respected bodies such as the W3C and standard authorities. Are citations [matching references provided to support facts and assertions? Are all references cited in the article, and are the references appropriately formatted according to Harvard style?	**25**	**22**
Total	**100**	**83**

Comments
In general this was an outstanding submission where the various requirements across different tasks were achieved to a high standard. **Task 1:** **The functionalities of this task have been achieved following object oriented design principle in an excellent fashion. They have been documented extremely well given as break down as tasks. Even though you indicated the design patterns and frameworks adopted, you could have also indicated the good OOP followed inside this task even [I can see you discuss them in Task 5]. From the class diagram, it is evident that the 4 pillars of OOP were maintained even in this task. Some of the assumptions of the coursework were incorporated in automated fashion for the implementation which was good to observe. Only some minor issues with regard to certain functionalities which have been documented and reflected upon.** **It would have helped if you could produce a top-level conceptual class diagram first – would have helped to explain the OO principle adopted there clearly. Then you may include the more detailed version as the current one. Also, checking account was treated a bit differently compared to the other two [notations suggest that]? The ERD reflects the maintained tables, and is appropriate.** **Task 2:** **This has been achieved relatively seamlessly because of the modular approach adopted in Task 1. The reflection in terms of pros and cons are well thought out.** **Task 3:** **Again this was achieved seamlessly because of the good OOP utilised in Task 1. This is evidenced/documented well. Good reflection [pros and cons].** **Task 4:**

Achieved together with the view. Documented appropriately. Agreed with the reflection that a better approach could have been explored. However, this really depended on the assumptions of how to perceive joint account since in the coursework, it was a bit open-ended.

Task 5:

Frameworks: Spring and Hibernate. Design Patterns: Singleton and MVC [there were some provisions of using other ones too – the reflection could have addressed that]. Discussion of ORM for contextualisation was included. The DAO model could be addressed here too. The 4 pillars of OOP (Abstraction, Encapsulation, Code-reuse/Inheritance and Polymorphism) have been discussed with supporting background research [references], and have been contextualised in terms of student's own implementation as well.

Final class diagram appears as a separate document. A number of relevant references – Harvard referencing and format were followed. Good job in that aspect as well.