

Contents

1	Intended Learning Outcomes	2
2	Group Member Roles	2
2.1	Alex Cummaudo	2
2.2	Jake Renzella	3
2.3	Lachlan West	3
2.4	Reuben Wilson	3
3	Assessment Requirements	3
3.1	Required Documents	3
3.1.1	Work Log	3
3.1.2	Contribution Statement	4
3.1.3	Peer Review Documentation	4
3.1.4	Self Assessment Report	4
3.2	Grade Breakdown	4
3.2.1	Pass	5
3.2.2	Credit	5
3.2.3	Distinction	5
3.2.4	High Distinction	6

1 Intended Learning Outcomes

Our team's assessment criteria agreement is based upon a subjective analysis of work contribution to the project that relates to the Intended Learning Outcomes of the Final Year Project unit. For reference, they are as thus:

1. Apply professional practice, including active and consistent participation, delivery of technical presentations, reflection, and adherence to ethical codes of conduct as a member of a software development team
2. Apply software engineering methods and contemporary software development tools to the scoping, analysis, and design of a software system to meet client needs
3. Communicate proficiently with project stakeholders, and function as an effective member or leader of a development team in project scoping, analysis and design activities
4. Conduct a critical analysis and evaluation of aspects relevant to a software development project and justify implications for project directions

Each of these learning outcomes are to be demonstrated in the Required Documents as a part of an individual group member's submission.

2 Group Member Roles

Each group member has a self-associated role that indicates their primary area of contribution to the project.

2.1 Alex Cummaudo

Alex will focus in the following key areas, in order of importance:

1. Team Lead
2. Primary Developer
3. UX/UI Developer
4. Documentation

2.2 Jake Renzella

Jake will focus in the following key areas, in order of importance:

1. Testing Co-Lead
2. Project Developer
3. UX/UI Developer
4. Documentation
5. Filming & Media

2.3 Lachlan West

Lachlan will focus in the following key areas, in order of importance:

1. Project Developer
2. Documentation

Lachlan will develop these roles over time, and therefore his area of expertise may develop into new areas not yet listed.

2.4 Reuben Wilson

1. Testing Co-Lead
2. Project Developer
3. Research
4. Filming & Media

3 Assessment Requirements

3.1 Required Documents

3.1.1 Work Log

Each group member must produce a work log, which clearly outlines how they have allocated and spent time on the project. Work logs outline any such activity that is related to bringing the project to a state of completion.

3.1.2 Contribution Statement

Each group member must produce a project contribution statement, endorsed by each of the other group members. The contribution statement should outline every aspect of contribution toward the project made by the group member that the contribution statement belongs to.

It is the responsibility of the group to collectively decide what grade bracket each contribution statement is worth in a meeting at the end of semester.

3.1.3 Peer Review Documentation

Each group member must produce relevant peer review documents¹ for each member of the group, including themselves. Peer review provides for the ability for each group member to rate each group member against a number of key metrics.

3.1.4 Self Assessment Report

Each group member must produce a Self Assessment Report, outlining how their contributions to the overall goal of the group align to the Intended Learning Outcomes. Furthermore, each group member must use the Self Assessment Report in order to **justify the grade that they have specified that they deserve based on their contributions to the project.**

It is **compulsory** that the Self Assessment Report clearly outlines all aspects of individual contribution to the project.

3.2 Grade Breakdown

Grade breakdowns are outlined below. In order to be eligible for grading, each group member must provide all required documents, as outlined above. as well as meeting all of the criteria specified within the target grade bracket.

¹See <https://github.com/final-year-project/documentation/wiki/Deliverables#7-peer-reviews>

3.2.1 Pass

Any group member who has done **the bare minimum** in regards to overall project contribution and progress. Such a grade would be awarded to a group member who has:

- **little to no input** in regards to project documentation, and
- **expressed no interest in voicing ideas** about actual project design and development requirements

Minimum amounts of actual project source code contribution would also contribute to such a grade being awarded to a group member.

3.2.2 Credit

Any group member who has produced **satisfactory amounts of work** in regards to project contribution.

Such a grade would be awarded to a group member who has:

- **little to moderate input** in regards to project documentation, and
- **has expressed some interest in voicing ideas** about actual project design and development requirements.

Any such group member who has shown reasonable initiative in regards to contributing to actual project source code would demonstrate eligibility for a credit.

3.2.3 Distinction

Any group member who has produced **significant amounts of work** in regards to project contribution.

Such a grade would be awarded to a group member who has:

- **moderate to large amounts of input** in regards to project documentation, and
- has expressed **significant interest in voicing ideas** about actual project design and development requirements.

Any such group member who has shown large amounts of initiative in regards to contributing to actual project source code would demonstrate eligibility for a distinction.

3.2.4 High Distinction

Any group member who has produced **significant amounts of work, showing initiative in new areas**, in regards to project contribution.

Such a grade would be awarded to a group member who has:

- **significant amounts of input** in regards to project documentation, and
- has **expressed significant interest in voicing ideas** about actual project design and development requirements.

Any such group member who has shown **large amounts of initiative** in regards to contributing to actual project source code would demonstrate eligibility for a distinction.

Additionally, any such group member who takes ownership over a particular aspect of the project development and demonstrates leadership in that field would be eligible for a High Distinction.

For example, a group member may decide to take ownership of unit testing and by doing so, commits to producing any relevant documentations in order to outline their contribution to that specific field and in order to educate the rest of the group about how unit testing is imperative to project integrity and progress.