

Final Submission

Capstone Computing Project 2

Final Submission (25 marks)

The final submission is very similar to a milestone submission, in that it includes both a group and a general part. Apart from the below modifications, use the format for Milestone Reports. In general, all parts in the final submission concern the overall completion of the product, not the progress of a particular sprint.

In this case the state of the product addresses the final state of the product, which is also an opportunity to explain any shortcomings or to highlight any strengths. Links to Bitbucket pull requests are only needed if they occurred after Milestone 4. There are also a couple of other additions that are required to finalize the project. Note that this is supposed to be the “realistic” version of the product’s state as opposed to the “marketing” or “idealised” one in the award submission documentation.

The Agile section should focus on how the measures used in previous group reports measured the actual progress of the project. If they indicated that the project was going to be completed on time and this did not occur, why not? If they indicated problems with completion but the product was completed anyway, what was done to achieve this? This does still need to include links to the minutes from meetings after Milestone 4 and the hours of team members in these two weeks.

The repository should now be complete. The final submission must link to each sprint branch product and address how the team has followed the branching plan for the semester.

Attribution is similar to the previous reports, documenting the work of group members in the final two weeks. Note, if your product was completed at the end of milestone 4 it is very likely that team members will not be putting in the full 10 hours per week in these final two weeks, and in this case it is permitted. Where the work of one or more students was not completed, those students may want up needing to work additional time to get their parts working at their discretion.

Overall, the aim of the project is to deliver a fully working product to the client in the manner specified. The main task of this report is to provide evidence that this has occurred. Part of the judgement of this will come from the documents submitted for the handover milestone; if any part of those indicated less than complete completion and this has been corrected since then, the group is encouraged to provide specific evidence of this.

The group must also (re)submit the following as part of their final submission:

- SRS
- Branching Plan
- If repairs have been made to the product after handover and the client agrees to fill in an updated Handover Document, this may be included. Otherwise the acceptance of these repairs can be submitted through testing and minutes as evidence.
- Detailed instructions on how to install and run their product, which may be the documentation provided to the client as part of handover.
- A specification of what software license (if any) the code will be released under. You should have discussed this with the client and evidence that by linking to minutes or e-mails. Note that most open source licenses will also require one or more files to be included as part of the code on your repository.
- Your award submission documentation (see below).

Award Submission (5)

It is required that the team (or one or more of its designated members) create a detailed summary of what you have achieved with your project. In order to maximize the utility of this, you are required to use the format needed for applying for a [WAITTA Incite award](#)¹. For students in campuses other than Bentley, you may be required to use a different format for a local award submission – check with your project lead. The requirements for this submission can be found on the web link given and a summary is included in the appendix.

It has become a tradition for teams to submit a summary of their project, which has previously been an A4 or A3 page that can be posted up. We're replacing this with the first requirement of the award submission – a short second video (criteria 2.3 a).

The rest of the documentation will take up a couple of pages. Note that the word limits are maximum amounts; you will probably want to get somewhat close but if you can say things concisely, all the better. It is important to be accurate but positive – this is effectively a marketing exercise

Marking

Both team and individual documents will gain marks for professionalism (10%) and your Agile section (10%) using the normal rubrics. In addition, both documents have their own rubric for the content of that document, which will contribute 80% of the marks for that assessment. The team document will be worth 15 marks while the individual document is worth 5 marks.

Note that individual contribution will be carefully considered for this assessment (even more so than with others). Where it is clear that the parts of the product that are not functioning can be attributed to certain team members, these team members are likely to be penalized. Team members whose parts of the product perform better (or are better documented) than the average for the team may have their mark increased. This is not designed to entirely counterbalance the overall worthiness of the product but to soften the blow if there are clear differences between the contribution of team members.

In addition to functionality of components, a team member who has obviously contributed less to the effort during the semester (as measured by hours, additional work, completed components and other factors) should expect to have their marks reduced while anyone who has shown exceptional contributions may be given an increase. Because this is judgement based, such decisions will be approved by the co-supervisor for each team.

Team Rubric (12 marks)

Not Present (0%)	Insufficient (25%)	Marginal (50%)	Good (75%)	Excellent (100%)
The document presented shows no real evidence that the most requirements are met and/or the product can largely be considered non-functional.	Either your product does not meet many of the core requirements or your evidence of this is so poor that it casts serious doubts whether the requirements ARE actually met.	It appears likely that your product works as desired and the client has cause to be at least mostly satisfied. Either you have not fulfilled all of the requirements or have not tested them sufficiently to show that they are fully satisfied in all cases.	You have shown that your product fulfils the majority of the high priority FRs and NFRs. Either there are one or more requirements that appear to be fulfilled but your document does not give sufficient evidence of this or you fulfil all	You have clearly demonstrated that your product fulfils all high priority requirements and sufficient others for the time available to you. To reach this level you need a product that fulfils the requirements

¹ You DO NOT need to apply for the award as part of the assessment, although you have the documents done and applying for student categories is free, so go ahead if you wish. We are merely using the format.

		<p>To reach this level you need a product that fulfils the most important functions in most cases, and a document that makes this clear.</p>	<p>such requirements but not enough of the lower priority one given the time available to you.</p> <p>To reach this level you need a product that both the client (with reasonable adjustment) and marker believe fulfils the requirements.</p>	<p>and documentation that gives clear evidence of this.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Individual Rubric (4 marks)

Not Present (0%)	Insufficient (25%)	Marginal (50%)	Good (75%)	Excellent (100%)
<p>The team member's part of the product has either not been completed to a satisfactory level or there is no substantial evidence to support this completion.</p>	<p>While there is some evidence that completion of the student's component has occurred, it is unconvincing.</p> <p>This is the highest category possible without links to appropriate commits on Bitbucket and proper attribution of work.</p> <p>If a significant proportion of the work is not attributed solely to this team member that also is a reason for selecting this category – individual progress is necessary.</p>	<p>While work has obviously been undertaken, there is insufficient evidence to show that the team member's product has been well tested and aligned with the completion of product requirements.</p> <p>This is the highest category possible without testing that is relatively complete.</p>	<p>Evidence has been given that the team member's work has been completed, and testing has been adequate. There are still shortcomings in either how the repository is managed or similar things.</p> <p>This is the highest category possible without evidence that the individual is complying with an agreed branching plan for the repository or the requirements of the component interaction diagram for the team member's components.</p>	<p>Completion has been achieved and evidence has been given that the team member's work has been adequately tested, that the branching plan and other requirements have been followed.</p> <p>This level includes things like the attributions being clear and the tasks completed making sense given requirement priorities.</p>

Appendix 1: Award Submission

For the purposes of the assessment, you need to complete the following categories (which have been modified slightly for this assessment).

2.3 Criteria

A) short product/innovation explanation – produce a video which explains your production/innovation. This should combine an explanation with sufficient visual appeal (perhaps in the form of screenshots or diagrams) that it could be used to advertise your program to future capstone students. The length of the video should be between 1 and 3 minutes.

Note: You should store or host this video and link to that, rather than uploading the video.)

B) Enter the summary details of your product, innovation, solution or project:

- 50 word summary – Key pitch for your Product/Solution to go on the WAITTA INCITE Awards website, program, promos, etc, should you become a finalist.
- Organisation/personal overview – Background to yourself, your company or team (if a joint submission, include both companies) (max 250 words).
- Product overview – Summary of the main features (max 250 words).

C) Category-specific information:

- Quality of Solution – Underlying technology used, understanding/implementation of the user requirements, methodology used, security (max 350 words).
- Innovation – Demonstrate uniqueness, complexity and creativity (max 350 words).
- Benefits Realisation – Understanding of the business environment, financial benefits, social benefits and efficiencies delivered, effectiveness of the solution in delivering its stated outcomes (350 words). (The client will normally complete this one, or you'll complete it after consulting the client.)

2.4 Supporting Documentation (Optional)

B) Upload any supporting documents in PDF or JPG format (max 5Mb, 5 files).

C) Upload links to any relevant websites, videos etc.

Award Rubric (5)

Not Present (0%)	Insufficient (25%)	Marginal (50%)	Good (75%)	Excellent (100%)
The team has not submitted a serious attempt or has submitted an attempt that would be likely to damage their reputation if submitted. It may be excessively brief, extremely poorly presented or contain serious errors.	While an attempt has been made, it cannot be seen as sufficient as requiring even brief thought to reject (from an award point of view) due to lack of content, errors or poor professionalism. This is the highest category possible without a video that is at least reasonable.	While work has obviously been undertaken, there is insufficient evidence to show that the team's product has been well presented and advertised in this submission. This is the highest category possible without a good video (more than just one talking face) and if any of the parts above are absent.	The team has completed all of the required parts in a well-presented and well-considered manner. There are no major detractors from the submission. The video is good and could be of sufficient quality to properly advertise the product produced to the public.	The submission is of a quality that (pending the project being of sufficient type and important – which is outside of the team's control) it is of sufficient quality for the awards ceremony. All parts must be present, all limits adhered to and the video must be clearly sufficient for showing in public.

		This level may also be used if any parts above are over the allowed word limit or extremely far under.		
--	--	--	--	--