

# Individual Reflection

[Start Assignment](#)

- Due Monday by 23:59
- Points 12
- Submitting a file upload
- File types pdf
- Available 19 Nov at 9:00 - 3 Dec at 23:59

## Individual Task Reports

Please read the project description here first -

[Group Project\\_Secure Software Engineering.pdf](https://myuni.adelaide.edu.au/courses/101188/files/18485178?wrap=1) (<https://myuni.adelaide.edu.au/courses/101188/files/18485178?wrap=1>)   
[https://myuni.adelaide.edu.au/courses/101188/files/18485178/download?download\\_frd=1](https://myuni.adelaide.edu.au/courses/101188/files/18485178/download?download_frd=1) \_  
[https://myuni.adelaide.edu.au/courses/74205/files/11822609/download?download\\_frd=1](https://myuni.adelaide.edu.au/courses/74205/files/11822609/download?download_frd=1) ..

Each group member should submit an individual reflection report. This assignment will be allocated a grade based on the University grade descriptors and the rubric given below.

This report should reflect individual contributions to the project and has the following structure:

- **Individual Task Report - Group <group number>**
  - your name and your ID
- **Project Overview**
  - a paragraph giving a high level summary of project goals
- **Individual Contributions**
  - You are expected to report what you have contributed to the final project.
  - The report should introduce the security or privacy issue you focused on and give a description of the related requirement, feature design, and solution you implemented. Please demonstrate the methodology and the functionality of the implementation.
- **Reflections**
  - Please also include your reflection of the project. For example, what you have learned in this project (e.g., programming skill, project management, or team work) and what could be improved in the future.
  - Each team members' performance/contribution in 1-5 scale and comments, including yourself (We will keep your feedback anonymous. This part will not be marked).
- **Appendix**
  - **The list of individual tasks**(Check 'Group Project Secure Software Engineering 2025.pdf' for more information)
  - In the list of individual tasks, for I2, instead of creating class diagrams and sequence diagrams, **you may provide user flow diagrams instead**.
- University Grade Descriptors

	<b>High Distinction</b>	<b>Distinction</b>	<b>Credit</b>	<b>Pass</b>	<b>Fail</b>
<b>General description</b>	Outstanding or exceptional work in terms of understanding, interpretation and presentation	A very high standard of work which demonstrates originality and insight	Demonstrates a high level of understanding and presentation and a degree of originality and insight	Satisfies the minimum requirements	Fails to satisfy the minimum requirements

### Individual Report

Criteria	Ratings				Pts
Project Overview	<b>3 to &gt;2.0 Pts</b> <b>0 Excellent</b> Clearly describe the core goals of your entire project. Highlight the key features of your final product.	<b>2 to &gt;1.0 Pts</b> <b>1 Good</b> The goals of your project are described without highlighting the key features or the key features are not clearly presented.	<b>1 to &gt;0.0 Pts</b> <b>2 Fair/Fail</b> The overview of project is not detailed enough.	<b>0 Pts</b> <b>3 No marks</b> None or almost no content	3 pts
Individual Contribution	<b>3 to &gt;2.0 Pts</b> <b>0 Excellent</b> Clearly reports the individual contributions with good and detailed descriptions.  Contributed as a key role to more than one (1) functionalities in the group project.	<b>2 to &gt;1.0 Pts</b> <b>1 Good</b> Good detail in some parts.  Contributed to at least one (1) functionalities in the group project.	<b>1 to &gt;0.0 Pts</b> <b>2 Fair/Fail</b> Have one of the following defects: minimal length, not detailed enough; or not clearly show your contribution to the project; or your contribution is not enough	<b>0 Pts</b> <b>3 No marks</b> None or almost no content	3 pts
Reflection	<b>3 to &gt;2.0 Pts</b> <b>0 Excellent</b> Clearly reports the individual reflections with good and detailed descriptions.	<b>2 to &gt;1.0 Pts</b> <b>1 Good</b> Good detail in some parts.	<b>1 to &gt;0.0 Pts</b> <b>2 Fair/Fail</b> Have one of the following defects: minimal length, not detailed enough; or not clearly show your reflection to the project	<b>0 Pts</b> <b>3 No marks</b> None or almost no content	3 pts
Presentation	<b>3 to &gt;2.0 Pts</b> <b>0 Excellent</b> Excellent structured and very pleasant to read; all arguments supported by accurate evidence and/or reference	<b>2 to &gt;1.0 Pts</b> <b>1 Good</b> Well structured and easy to follow; a few mistakes in grammar and/or spelling; almost all arguments supported by evidence and/or reference	<b>1 to &gt;0.0 Pts</b> <b>2 Fair/Fail</b> Poorly structured; some parts missing; various mistakes in grammar and/or spelling	<b>0 Pts</b> <b>3 No marks</b> None or almost no content	3 pts

Total points: 12