Australian National University

Project Reviews

Project Reviews are used to assess the progress of each team. They are designed to provide a fair assessment of each team even though the work undertaken by each team can be very different.

There will be three project reviews each semester. Each review will comprise three activities totaling 25% of your final mark:

Project Report [15%]

A snapshot of your group's work and progress

Requirements

The aim of the Project Report is to provide reviewers with a summary of what you have achieved since the start of the project or the previous review. It should be short and to the point (3-4 pages). It will provide references to the artefacts you have produced including, as applicable, documentation, source code and prototypes. You will ensure that reviewers can gain access to your work, including access to repositories and physical artefacts.

Refer to Indicative Progress below for the kind of progress we expect to see at each review.

Assessment Process

Projects will be assessed using our Common Assessment Process (CAP).

Each project will be reviewed by your tutor and your tutorial observers (your peers) in accordance with CAP Stage 1. Each team will also submit a **self evaluation** in accordance with CAP Stage 1.

CAP forms for Project Report evaluation can be found here

Submission

Project Reports and your self evaluations are to be submitted by 0900 on the Monday of the review week (ie. weeks 5, 8 and 11).

Submission will be via Turnitin on Wattle. You should submit original work. The ANU takes plagiarism seriously, and submissions that may not be original will be fully investigated in accordance with the ANU Academic Misconduct Rule 2015.

Peer Evaluation [5%]

A professional review of another group's work

Requirements

As indicated above, each student will complete a CAP Stage 1 evaluation of the team they are observing in tutorials. You will use the Project Report submitted by the team as the basis of your review. You are required to not only review the report, but also the artefects produced by the team and referenced in their report.

Assessment Process

Peer Evaluations will be assessed using our Common Assessment Process (CAP).

The quality of your evaluation of your peers will be assessed by your tutor in accordance with CAP Stage 1. Note that we are experimenting with the use of AI to assist in evaluating the quality of CAP Stage 1 evaluations. We may use these tools to assist tutors in evaluating your Peer Evaluations.

CAP forms for Peer Evaluation can be found here

Submission

Peer evaluations are to be submitted by 0900 on the Monday of the week following the applicable review (ie. weeks 6, 9 and 12)

Submission will be via Turnitin on Wattle. You should submit original work. The ANU takes plagiarism seriously, and submissions that may not be original will be fully investigated in accordance with the ANU Academic Misconduct Rule 2015.

Project Pitch [5%]

A brief update pitch on your project

Requirements

Each team will deliver a 5-minute pitch for tutors, examiners, other teams, clients and invited guests. Each pitch will be followed by 5 minutes for questions.

Your pitch should cover the following:

- What problem are you solving
- How are you solving it and how is your approach different
- If applicable, a demo of the latest developments
- If applicable, ask for the things you need to continue the project

Assessment Process

Project Pitches will be assessed using our Common Assessment Process (CAP).

Everyone in attendance will be invited to evaluate each pitch in accordance with CAP Stage 1.

CAP forms for Project Pitch evaluation can be found here

Submission

There are no submissions associated with this activity.

Location and Time

Project pitches will be run in sessions of 2 hours. Each session will comprise eight pitches. The times of project pitching sessions will be organised the week before using a Doodle poll advertised on Piazza.

Tips and suggestions

Never do anything that does not add value

Everything you do in your project must add value for the client, your team, your peers and/or you.

If you find yourselves doing something that does not appear to be a good use of time, or seems unnecessary, then STOP and REFLECT - do you really need what you are doing, have you missed something, can you use your time better?

The 'Triple Bottom Line'

In order to do well in project reviews, you should also consider a 'Triple Bottom Line'

- Do the best you can for your client or business
- Work on learning as much professionally as you can
- Get as good a mark as you can

These three objectives are interlinked. Focussing on one to the exclusion of the others does not give the best result even for the one that is the sole focus. For example:

- Focussing on marks will not necessarily get you the marks because you may have neglected the needs of your client or business
- Learning about teamwork, stakeholder engagement and applicable technology will lead to improved satisfaction of client needs and, ultimately, better marks
- You will need to learn a great deal during the course to satisfy the needs of your client. In doing so, you will be able to present a great story in your project review, leading to great marks
- Doing the best you can for your client or business may lead to good marks, but only if you follow the assessment scheme and submit work on time

Presenting your work :

- Be honest and open - cards on the table. There are people around who know the truth
- Be enthusiastic about your work and proud of what you have achieved
- Act like a team. No backbiting or contradictions
- When pitching - everyone to look engaged. No Phones
- Talk about what you have learned from both failure and success - technical and project perspectives.
- Always have something concrete to show or demo
- Remember that some people will have no idea what you are doing. Set the scene for the context for the system you are developing, what the client's business is and what they want you to do

Indicative Progress

Because every project will be on a different timeline, tutors will work with you during the tutor meetings help you understand what your progress should look like. A really loose indication of timing is:

Single Semester Projects (eg. ENGN4221)

Project Review 1 (week 5)

- clear idea of the project requirements and goals
- met with the client, checked requirements, etc
- initial prototypes, sketches, designs, processes, etc
- team has a clear idea on how to provide value to the client
- appropriate documentation as evidence of progress is up to date (covering Requirements analysis, Functional Behaviour analysis, Architectural synthesis and Validation & Verification)

Project Review 2 (week 8)

- the design, idea, prototype, etc has been tested in the hands of the client
- feedback from the client is now being built into a second iteration of the idea
- team is moving towards thinking about hand-over and what will happen beyond the immediate project
- appropriate documentation as evidence of progress is up to date and revised where necessary (covering Requirements analysis, Functional Behaviour analysis, Architectural synthesis and Validation & Verification)

Project Review 3 (week 11)

- design/idea/process has been validated
- team has prepared hand-over material for the next phase of the project
- appropriate documentation as evidence of progress is up to date and revised where necessary (covering Requirements analysis, Functional Behaviour analysis, Architectural synthesis and Validation & Verification)

Two Semester Projects (eg. COMP projects)

Semester 1, Project Review 1 (week 5)

- team established and cohesive. The use of brainstorming or ideation sessions early on has proven beneficial in terms of getting started and establishing mutual respect within a team
- a strong relationship with client or market, and tutor
- a good understanding of their client or market
- an initial high level plan

Semester 1, Project Review 2 (week 8)

- set of requirements
- start-up projects will have explored their proposed business model using a tool such as the Businesses Model Canva.
- explored what is feasible by developing prototypes, identifying libraries, frameworks and other tools for later use, and/or undertaking appropriate research and experimentation
- functional engineering environment including a repository, version control and configuration management, documentation standards, planning and issue tracking tools, and team communication mechanisms. Tools worth considering include gitlab.cecs.anu.edu.au, trello.com and slack.com.

Semester 1, Project Review 3 (week 11)

- a Minimal Viable Product (MVP). This will involve the execution of appropriate planning, management, requirements engineering, architecture, design, review and testing activities
- Start-up teams may have a product in the hands of users (perhaps a limited set of early adopters/testers)
- Client projects may have delivered an initial version of their software to the customer. If this is not achieved now, it should be delivered early in the second semester of the project

Semester 2, Project Review 1 (week 5)

- will have a functional product that is close to complete.
- have followed and adapted their plan, and applied appropriate systems and software engineering practices

Semester 2, Project Review 2 (week 8)

- will have deployed their product
- supporting users
- enhancing product

Semester 2, Project Review 3 (week 11)

- finalise project
- attention to the transition of their project to the client or the next stage of the project

UPDATED: **01 Mar 2017**/ RESPONSIBLE OFFICER: **Head of School**/ PAGE CONTACT: **TechLauncher Course Webmaster**