

S

School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics

Assessment Brief Form

Module Title:	Integrated Group Project
Module Code:	CI536
Author(s)/Marker(s) of Assignment	Karl Cox

Assignment No:	1
Assignment Title:	Group Assignment
Percentage contribution to module mark:	100
Weighting of component assessments within this assignment:	100
Module Learning Outcome/s Covered: (Refer to module syllabus)	<p>On successful completion of the module the student will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Function as a computing professional, with understanding of professional, legal, ethical and information security issues in a business and commercial context 2. Research and analyse problem situations; model the requirements of possible solutions before implementation 3. Work effectively in an agile team, plan projects and manage time 4. Effectively manage the development process, adhering to an agile project process 5. Design, specify and implement usable ICT solutions which address the problems and requirements 6. Assess the fitness for purpose of such an ICT solution
Date of issue:	7 Feb 2022
Deadline for submission:	<p>Formative Assessments: Formative assessments occurs in tutorials, including a demonstration of prototypes by all groups, stand-up meetings and review of documents.</p> <p>Summative Assessment: 15:00, 20th May 2022 (Report/Presentation and supporting documents)</p> <p>Presentation will take place in tutorials commencing week of 16th May)</p>
Method of submission:	Submit by e-submission to TurnItIn only by 3pm
Date feedback will be provided	17th June 2022

Assignment Brief and Assessment Criteria:

Brief

Working in groups, students will undertake the creation of a prototype software artefact applying best practice project management and user centred design techniques

Suggested artefacts

- Game marketplace for mobile games.
- Marketplace for students in Brighton to buy and sell items.
- Augmented reality mobile application that will help new students find their way around the Moulsecoomb campus.
- Repository for reporting sports results, and disseminating them with a live feed sign up site.
- Interactive educational game to help primary school pupils understand the importance of clean drinking water in developing countries
- Chatbot to help users choose a new laptop.

You are also free to select your own project which meets the learning outcomes for the module but you must get approval from the module tutor.

Assignment Groups

These will be decided within the first two weeks of semester 2. You must form your own groups (4-6 members) but if you don't have a group by the end of week 2, you will be placed in a group by the module team.

Please inform your tutor of your group members (full names please).

Formative Assessed Deliverables

It is expected that students will present the current status of their projects in tutorials by peer review by demonstrating:

- Their project status (e.g. through stand-up meetings)
- Their deliverables
- The prototype

Summative Assessed Deliverables

- A report **OR** a 30-minute presentation together with supporting documentation (100%) (more details below)
- An individual assessment of your group members' contribution which will be used to scale each student's mark to be submitted as part of your report/presentation

Report

The report has a similar structure to that used for the final year individual project:

- *Cover page*: Project title, Group members, Lab tutor name
- *Table of Contents* – using numbered headings and subheadings
- *Introduction*: Summary of project goals, and achievements (One page)
- *Methodology*: Explanation of choice of relevant methodologies such as project management, surveys, development tools/environments, testing and UX approach.
- *Product Description*: What has been created including a link to a short video demonstration, where relevant, explanation of requirements, design, implementation and evaluation of choices and outcomes;
- *Legal, ethical and security issues*: A discussion of issues relevant to your project;

- *Evaluation of fitness for purpose*: Describe the criteria by which your creation could be evaluated to evaluate its fitness for purpose.
- *Critical Review*: Review success and areas for improvement, emphasise what has been learnt and how this would affect future projects
- *References*: A full accurate list of references to all sources of information that you have used including the source of any non-original material such as code and media assets. This should be presented in Harvard format.
- Appendices

Appendix 1: Record of team meetings with information on what was discussed at meetings, decisions that were made.

Appendix 2: Source/Asset files. Where appropriate, a link should be provided to an external repository such as GitHub that contains the source code/asset files required to build/create the project. The location/content must be agreed with the LAB tutor.

Appendix 3: Any further resources you think are relevant to the project.

The report together with any supporting documentation should be submitted through Grade Centre.

Presentation

As an alternative to a Report, students may create a 30-minute presentation covering equivalent information to the Report including:

- Project plans
- Security requirements
- UXD documentation
- Test scripts
- Screen shots and demonstration of prototype (e.g. ranging from paper prototype to functional)

The presentation together with relevant supporting documents should be submitted through Grade Centre.

Assessment Criteria

Distinction **70-79** **A A-** **80-100** **A+** **First Class**

All learning outcomes/ assessment criteria have been achieved *to an exceptionally high level (A+)* or to a high standard and many at an exceptionally high level (A/A-). An **outstanding(A+)/excellent(A/A-)** response to the task. The work demonstrates most or all of the following¹:

- (A+) *beyond that expected for work at the given level of study within the discipline:*
- (A/A-) in relation to those expected at the given level of study within the discipline:
- In depth(A/A-)/*exceptional*(A+) display of understanding, exploration, insight and/or research
- All specifications for the assessment task, including word limit where appropriate, have been adhered to
- The organisation, structure and standard of presentation of the work, including referencing where appropriate, are *exemplary*(A+)/*excellent*(A/A-) throughout
- The work has been approached and/or executed/performed in an original way
- *Inspirational, innovative and authoritative - evidence of intellectual rigour*(A+), independence of judgement and insightful contextualisation, including relevant theory/literature/artefacts (A+/A/A-)
- Evidence of *very high*(A+)/*high*(A/A-) quality analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal
- *Consistently displays*(A+)/*demonstrates*(A/A-) very high levels of initiative, personal responsibility, decision-making and achievement

Merit **60-69** **B+ B B-** **Upper Second Class**

All learning outcomes/assessment criteria have been met fully at a good or very good standard. A **good to very good** response to the task. The work demonstrates most or all of the following¹:

- Good to very good understanding and exploration, some insight and/or thorough research
- No significant inaccuracies, misunderstandings or errors
- The specifications for the assessment task, including word limit where appropriate, have been adhered to
- The work is well organised, coherent and the standard of presentation, including referencing where appropriate, is at least good
- The work has been approached and/or executed/performed in a comprehensive and appropriate way

¹Characteristics in relation to those expected at the given level of study within the discipline

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appropriate contextualisation, including relevant theory/ literature/ artefacts ○ Evidence of high quality analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal ○ Demonstrates good levels of initiative, personal responsibility, decision-making and achievement 		
Pass	50-59 C+ C C-	Lower Second Class
<p>All learning outcomes/assessment criteria have been met and some may have been achieved at a good standard. A sound, competent response to the task. The work demonstrates <u>most or all</u> of the following¹:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sound understanding and exploration, some insight and/or appropriate research ○ No significant inaccuracies and/or misunderstandings ○ No significant aberrations from the specifications for the assessment task, including word limit where appropriate ○ The work is suitably organised² and the standard of presentation, including referencing where appropriate, is at least sound ○ The work has been approached and/or executed/performed in a standard way ○ Sound analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal ○ Demonstrates some levels of initiative, personal responsibility, decision-making and achievement 		
Pass	40-49 D+ D D-	Third Class
<p>All learning outcomes/assessment criteria have just been met. An adequate, but weak response to the task. The work demonstrates <u>most or all</u> of the following¹:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate understanding and/or exploration of major ideas with little insight and/or minimal research ○ Some minor inaccuracies and/or misunderstandings ○ Some minor aberrations from the specifications for the assessment task, including word limit where appropriate ○ The work is largely descriptive³, some parts of the work are disorganised and the standard of presentation, including referencing where appropriate, is barely adequate ○ The work has been approached and/or executed/performed in a basic and/or poor way ○ Some, but limited, evidence of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal ○ Demonstrates limited levels of initiative, personal responsibility, decision-making and achievement 		
Fail	30-39 E+ E E-	

² Clearly presented but with little development

³ Although generally coherent there is some lack of clarity of thought or expression. Poor quality in at least one area

One or more of the learning outcomes/assessment criteria have not been met.

An **unsatisfactory** response to the task. The work may display some strengths but these are outweighed by several weak features in relation to those expected at the given level of study within the discipline, such as:

- Limited understanding and/or exploration of major ideas with very little insight and/or minimal research
- Some significant inaccuracies and/or misunderstandings
- Insufficient attention paid to some of the assessment criteria and some significant aberrations from the specifications for the assessment task⁴
- The work is too descriptive, parts of the work are disorganised and unclear and the standard of presentation, including referencing where appropriate, is poor
- The work has been approached and/or executed/performed in a poor way
- Insufficient evidence of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal
- Little evidence of initiative, personal responsibility, decision-making and achievement

Fail

10-29 F+ F

0-9 F-

Few(F+/F)/almost none(F-) of the learning outcomes/assessment criteria have not been met

An **unsatisfactory** response to the task.

- Any strengths of the work are heavily outweighed by many weak features in relation to those expected at the given level of study within the discipline(F+/F), such as:
- Or the work fails to meet the requirements in relation to those expected at the given level of study within the discipline(F-), exemplified by most or all of the following:
- Very limited(F+/F)/almost no(F-) understanding and/or exploration of major ideas with little or no insight and/or minimal research
- Several significant(F+/F)/many serious(F-) inaccuracies and/or misunderstandings
- Insufficient(F+/F)/no(F-) attention paid to several(F+/F)/most(F-) of the assessment criteria and some serious deviations from the specifications for the assessment task⁵
- The work is descriptive and the standard of presentation including referencing where appropriate is very poor
- The work has been approached and/or executed/performed inadequately

Little to no(F-) evidence of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal Little to no(F-) evidence of initiative, personal responsibility, decision-making and achievement

⁴ Such as not keeping to the word limit and/or minor elements of the work missing

⁵ Such as not keeping to the word limit and/or major elements of the work missing

1. *A copy of your coursework submission may be made as part of the University of Brighton's and School of Computing, Engineering & Mathematics procedures which aim to monitor and improve quality of teaching. You should refer to your student handbook for details.*
2. *All work submitted must be your own (or your team's for an assignment which has been specified as a group submission) and all sources which do not fall into that category must be correctly attributed. The markers may submit the whole set of submissions to the JISC Plagiarism Detection Service.*