School of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE)

COMP9900 Information Technology Project
COMP3900 Computer Science Project

2023 Term 3

Week 10

Dr Rachid Hamadi
(r.hamadi@unsw.edu.au)

UNSW
SYDNEY

Outline

- Remaining Assessment Items
- Final Project Demo
- Project Report
- Software Quality
- Peer Assessment
- Project Topics Statistics
- Q & A

Remaining Assessment Items

Remaining Assessment Items

Assessment	Type	Weighting	Aligned CLOs*	Due Date**
1. Proposal	Group	10%	CLOs 1, 3, 5-7	Friday Week 3 @ 9pm
2. Progressive Demo A	Group	2.5%	CLOs 2-7	Week 5 Lab Time
3. Retrospective A	Group	2.5%	CLO 5	Saturday Week 5 @ 9pm
4. Progressive Demo B	Group	2.5%	CLOs 2-7	Week 8 Lab Time
5. Retrospective B	Group	2.5%	CLO 5	Saturday Week 8 @ 9pm
6. Final Project Demo	Group	20%	CLOs 2-7	Week 10 Lab Time
7. Project Report	Group	20%	CLOs 1, 2, 5-7	Friday Week 10 @ 9pm
8. Software Quality	Group	20%	CLOs 2-7	Friday Week 10 @ 9pm
9. Participation & Peer Assessment	Individual	20%	CLOs 1-7	Saturday Week 10 @ 9pm

***CLOs = Course learning outcomes**

****All dates and times are Sydney NSW Australia dates and times**

Final Submissions Deadline

- **Week 10 – Friday 17 November 2023 @ 21.00 (Week 10)**
- Submission instructions are stated in Moodle
- One **Report** + **Final System** submissions per group
- Mandatory **Peer Assessment text file** per team member (or student) to be submitted by
  Saturday 18 November 2023 @ 21.00 (Week 10)

Results and Feedback

- **Proposal**, **Progressive Demos A and B**, and **Retrospectives A and B feedback** and **marks** already released in Moodle
- Remaining results (including **Peer**) will be made available via Moodle, with marking rubrics for **Final Demo**, **Report**, and **Software Quality** submissions also in Moodle after the publication of results by UNSW
- A notice will be posted in Moodle when all marks are released

Remaining Assessment Items

Results in Moodle

3. Final Demo, Report & Code		
Final Project Demo		
$\bar{x}$ **Final Project Demo total** Simple weighted mean of grades. Include empty grades.	-	**0.0–20.0**
Project Final System		
Project Source Code	-	0.0–20.0
$\bar{x}$ **Project Final System total** Simple weighted mean of grades. Include empty grades.	-	**0.0–20.0**
Project Report		
Project Report Submission	-	0.0–20.0
$\bar{x}$ **Project Report total** Simple weighted mean of grades. Include empty grades.	-	**0.0–20.0**
$\bar{x}$ **3. Final Demo, Report & Code total** Simple weighted mean of grades. Include empty grades.	-	**0.0–60.0**
4. Participation & Peer Review		
Peers	-	0.0–20.0
$\bar{x}$ **4. Participation & Peer Review total** Simple weighted mean of grades. Include empty grades.	-	**0.0–20.0**

Final Project Demo

Final Project Demo

- Final Project Demo worth **20% (or 20 marks)**
- Divided into two main criteria:
  - **Technical Quality** and **Completeness** of the Project as Demonstrated worth **70% (or 14 marks)**
  - **Structure** and **Delivery** of the Demo/Presentation worth **30% (or 6 marks)**

Final Project Demo

Category	Max Mark	Team Mark
Technical Quality and Completeness of the Project as Demonstrated (70%)	**14**	
Complete, fully functional, correct and coherent demonstration/presentation by all team members, covering all project objectives	6	
User interfaces are well designed and working without issues	4	
High technical quality, demonstrating excellent engineering practice, and solid methodology	4	
Structure and Delivery of the Demo/Presentation (30%)	**6**	
Demonstration is well prepared, and confidently and professionally delivered	2	
Demonstration is well structured with evidence of good team work	2	
Q and A handled well	1.5	
Adherence to demo/presentation time requirements	0.5	
Total Mark (out of 20)	**20**	**0**

Final Project Demo

- Examples of **high technical quality** include (but not limited)
  - providing a well thought out diagram overview of the system architecture
  - a great description of how the system design provides fault tolerance
  - correctly describing at a high level why the domain model is maintainable/extendable

Final Project Demo

- Examples of **excellent engineering practice and solid methodology** include (but not limited)

  - using test-driven approach to development
  - using behaviour-driven approach to development
  - using unit testing
  - using pull requests for code reviews
  - using retrospectives
  - using pair programming

Project Report

Project Report

- Project Report worth **20% (or 20 marks)**
- Overview **10% (or 2 marks)**
- Functionalities and Implementation Challenges **50% (or 10 marks)**
- Installation/User Document/Manual **30% (or 6 marks)**
- Document Presentation, Title Page, References and Others **10% (or 2 marks)**

Project Report

Category	Max Mark	Team Mark	Comments
Overview (10%)	**2**		
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		
Functionalities and Implementation Challenges (50%)	**10**		
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		
Installation/User Document/Manual (30%)	**6**		
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		
Document Presentation, Title Page, References (10%)	**2**		
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		
Total Mark (out of 20)	**20**		

Software Quality

Software Quality

- Software Quality worth **20% (or 20 marks)**
- Technical Depth and Novelty **45% (or 9 marks)**
- Correctness and Performance **30% (or 6 marks)**
- Code Style, Structure, and Readability **12.5% (or 2.5 marks)**
- Interface and Usability **12.5% (or 2.5 marks)**

Software Quality

Category	Max Mark	Team Mark	Comments
Technical Depth and Novelty (45%)	**9**		
Not done or very poorly done	0		
Implementation far from completion	1.8		
Partial implementation according to the scope of all project objectives without solving technical challenges	3.6		
Complete implementation and solving some technical challenges	5.4		
Complete implementation with good degree of technical novelty and functional novelty	7.2		
Complete implementation with excellent degree of technical novelty and functional novelty	9		
Correctness and Performance (30%)	**6**		
Not done or very poorly done	0		
Buggy and unacceptable performance	1.2		
Overall correct but slow	2.4		
Overall correct and acceptable performance	3.6		
Robust and good performance	4.8		
Robust and excellent performance	6		
Code Style, Structure, and Readability (12.5%)	**2.5**		
Not done or very poorly done	0		
Messy code structures and difficult to read	0.5		
Not well organized but readable	1		
Well structured and readable code with some documentation	1.5		
Well structured and readable code with ample documentation	2		
Easy to read, well documented, and demonstration of excellent coding style and practice	2.5		
User Interfaces and Usability (12.5%)	**2.5**		
Not done or very poorly done	0		
Primitive user interfaces and difficult to use	0.5		
Poorly designed user interfaces but still usable	1		
Good UI design with usability issues on some cases	1.5		
Good UI design and ease of use in all aspects	2		
Professional UI design and excellent usability	2.5		
Total Mark (out of 20)	**20**		

Peer Assessment

Peer Assessment

- Peer Assessment worth **20% (or 20 marks)**
- Each member **must** submit a text file (namely **<your zID>.txt**)
- Each line of this file contains the zID of your group member, followed by a space, followed by an integer score from **0 to 10** (or **0 to 5**)
- You can add **comments** if needed using **#**
- **Do not** include yourself in the file
- The score is to indicate the **relative efforts and contributions** of **other members from your perspective**

Assumption for Sharing the Group Marks

- **Roles**: each group should have a **Scrum Master** and **four** (or **three**) **Developers**
- Their **responsibilities** were discussed in the first two lectures
- Note that these roles are for **accountability**
- We expect that all members should be **involved** in **coding**
- The Scrum Master may contribute marginally less coding efforts, e.g., **5%** less, if she/he will administrate **GitHub** (having a **Maintainer** role) and **Jira site** for the team

GitHub and Jira site

- If **extreme** scores are obtained within a group, records on **GitHub** and **Jira site** will be used to substantiate these scores
- Therefore, please keep the **GitHub** and **Jira site** accounts up to date and for **at least a month** after you receive the course grade from COMP3900/9900

Sample peers.txt

```
## The Champion Team
#
```

Assume you are z0000125

```
z0000123 8
z0000124 6
z0000125 6
z0000126 3
z0000127 6

#z0000123 made most of the design decision and did lots of coding.
#She was the key person making the project integrated into one piece
#
#z0000126 made very little contribution to the team.
#This has also been reflected in his rare activities on GitHub and Jira
```

Peer Assessment

<your zID>.txt

- You can add comments in your text file by beginning a line with '#' or by adding '#' and comments at the end of an existing line
- The text file shall include all the group members ***except yourself***. Otherwise, the whole file will be ignored during the score calculation
- All group members must submit this file. However, tutors and the lecturer may put in a rating based on the **participation records** and their **impression**. Please keep Jira and GitHub accounts for **at least one month** after you receive the course grade for COMP3900/9900
- Your text file will be **anonymized**

Peer Assessment

Mark/80	60	<-- enter mark out of 80 for the group here

raw scores	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5
s1		7	8	8	8
s2	6		6	5	6
s3	8	9		9	8
s4	7	8	7		7
s5	8	9	7	9	
max	8	9	8	9	8

<-- enter Peers assessment for all members in this table

This is an example where scores per member are different

scaled to 10	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5	Avg	Peers mark/20	Final mark/100
s1		7.8	10.0	8.9	10.0	9.2	**15.4**	**75.4**
s2	7.5		7.5	5.6	7.5	7.0	**11.8**	**71.8**
s3	10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0	10.0	**16.8**	**76.8**
s4	8.8	8.9	8.8		8.8	8.8	**14.8**	**74.8**
s5	10.0	10.0	8.8	10.0		9.7	**16.3**	**76.3**
					Mean	**8.9**		

Peer Assessment

Mark/80	60	<-- enter mark out of 80 for the group here

raw scores	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5
s1		9	7	8	7
s2	6		7	8	7
s3	6	9		8	7
s4	6	9	7		7
s5	6	9	7	8	
max	6	9	7	8	7

<-- enter Peers assessment for all members in this table

This is an example where ALL scores per member are same

scaled to 10	s1	s2	s3	s4	s5	Avg	Peers mark/20	Final mark/100
s1		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	**15.0**	**75.0**
s2	10.0		10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	**15.0**	**75.0**
s3	10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0	10.0	**15.0**	**75.0**
s4	10.0	10.0	10.0		10.0	10.0	**15.0**	**75.0**
s5	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0		10.0	**15.0**	**75.0**
					Mean	**10.0**		

Peer Assessment

Mark/80	60	<-- enter mark out of 80 for the group here

raw scores	z1111111	z2222222	z3333333	z4444444	z5555555
z1111111		6	7	7	8
z2222222	5		6	5	7
z3333333	8	7		8	7
z4444444	2	3	2		2
z5555555	9	8	9	9	
max	9	8	9	9	8

<-- enter Peers assessment for all members in this table

This is an example where any peers mark exceeds 20

scaled to 10	z1111111	z2222222	z3333333	z4444444	z5555555	Avg	Peers mark/20	Final mark/100
z1111111		7.5	7.8	7.8	10.0	8.3	**17.0**	**77.0**
z2222222	5.6		6.7	5.6	8.8	6.6	**13.7**	**73.7**
z3333333	8.9	8.8		8.9	8.8	8.8	**18.2**	**78.2**
z4444444	2.2	3.8	2.2		2.5	2.7	**5.5**	**65.5**
z5555555	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0		10.0	**20.6**	**80.6**
					Mean	**7.3**		

Max (formula)	Coefficient
20.6	0.97037037

Adjusted Peers Marks

Peers mark/20	Final mark/100
16.5	**76.5**
13.3	**73.3**
17.6	**77.6**
5.3	**65.3**
20.0	**80.0**

Project Topics Statistics

Project Topics Statistics

Project	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13	P14	P15	P16	P17	P18	P19	P20	P21	P22	P23	P24	P25	#Teams
COMP3900		0	0			0	2	1	2	2		1	2		4	7	1	3	0	14	2	4	9	0	4	58
COMP9900		1	2			2	0	4	0	3		1	0		0	11	0	5	2	11	3	4	4	1	2	56
Total	0	1	2	0	0	2	2	5	2	5	0	2	2	0	4	18	1	8	2	25	5	8	13	1	6	114
Percentage	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	2%	2%	4%	2%	4%	0%	2%	2%	0%	4%	16%	1%	7%	2%	22%	4%	7%	11%	1%	5%	100%

- **P16 – Tutor Management Web Platform**
- **P20 – Woolworths/Coles Collectables Exchange Management System**
- **P23 – Web Platform for Connecting Professionals with Projects**

Shape our Future

Tell us about your experience and shape the future of education at UNSW

Click the myExperience link in Moodle

or login to myExperience.unsw.edu.au

(use **z1234567@ad.unsw.edu.au** if your zID is 1234567 to login)

The survey is confidential, your identity will never be released

Survey results are not released to teaching staff until after your results are published

UNSW SYDNEY

Thank You for Taking COMP[39]900

Good luck for your next journey!

Q & A