

# COMP3900/9900

## 2023 Term 3

### Project Report Assessment

❖ **Project Report** (due **Friday 17 November 2023 Week 10 @ 9.00pm**) (worth **20%**)

The project report should be prepared according to the instructions below and should at least include the following information:

1. Using similar format as the project proposal, your report should be **at least 20 pages long**, excluding the **title page**, the **table of contents**, and the **references pages**, and be in **PDF** format.
2. **Title page** similar to that of the project proposal, with the project report submission date.
3. **Table of contents** and **page numbers**.
4. **Overview** - Architecture/design of the overall system and functionalities.
5. Descriptions of the **functionalities** developed by the team and how they **map/address all project objectives/requirements**.
6. **Proper references and brief descriptions of ALL third-party functionalities** (clouds/services/APIs/libraries/code) used by the team, with justification for their use and discussion how their licensing terms impact results of this project.
7. **Implementation challenges**: descriptions of any tricks, non-trivial algorithms, special architecture/design, etc.
8. **Installation/User document/manual**: how to build, setup, configure, and use your system and functionalities.
9. Use either **APA** (<https://student.unsw.edu.au/apa>) or **Harvard** (<https://student.unsw.edu.au/harvard-referencing>) referencing style.

The following marking criteria will be used for the Project Report assessment item.

## Project Report Marking Criteria

| Category  | Max Mark  | Team Mark | Comments |
|---|-----------|-----------|----------|
| <b>Overview (10%)</b>   | <b>2</b>  |           |          |
| Not provided / Missing  | 0         |           |          |
| Fails to present the overall picture (design and architecture) of the project   | 0.4       |           |          |
| Provides vague/insufficient design and architecture descriptions  | 0.8       |           |          |
| Provides clear design and architecture, but has weaknesses or technical issues with them  | 1.2       |           |          |
| Provides clear and correct design and architecture  | 1.6       |           |          |
| Provides concise and professional presentation of design and architecture   | 2         |           |          |
| <b>Functionalities and Implementation Challenges (50%)</b>  | <b>10</b> |           |          |
| Not provided / Missing  | 0         |           |          |
| Clearly deficient, lack of any useful details   | 2         |           |          |
| "Thin" results, lacking intellectual engagement, lack of justifications   | 4         |           |          |
| Several functionalities of the software not coherently linked   | 6         |           |          |
| Solid, coherent work, linking all the functionalities together into a consistent story. Good description on solving difficult technical, research, or implementation issues | 8         |           |          |
| Outstanding, coherent and consistent functionalities; and description on solving difficult technical, research, or implementation issues                                    | 10        |           |          |
| <b>Installation/User Document/Manual (30%)</b>  | <b>6</b>  |           |          |
| Not provided / Missing  | 0         |           |          |
| Insufficient / incorrect instructions to compile, build, setup or use the software  | 1.2       |           |          |
| Unclear instructions but can still follow to build and run the software   | 2.4       |           |          |
| Easy to follow to build and setup. Some functionality documentation, but not enough information to cover all the functionality usages                                       | 3.6       |           |          |
| Complete and correct instructions   | 4.8       |           |          |
| Professional and concise instructions (correct and complete)  | 6         |           |          |
| <b>Document Presentation, Title Page, References (10%)</b>  | <b>2</b>  |           |          |
| Not done or very poorly done  | 0         |           |          |
| Impedes document reading or missing sections  | 0.4       |           |          |
| Poor formatting and document structure  | 0.8       |           |          |
| Poor judgement with respect to layout and possible padding  | 1.2       |           |          |
| Minor issues, but overall high quality  | 1.6       |           |          |
| Professional, easy to read and high quality presentation (such as layout and design)  | 2         |           |          |
| <b>Total Mark (out of 20)</b>   | <b>20</b> |           |          |