Assignment Cover Page

Programme		Course Code and Title	
Bachelor of Computer Science (Hons)		CSE3033/N Software Engineering	
Student's name / student's id		**Lecturer's name**	
		Tan Phit Huan	
Date issued	**Submission Deadline**		**Indicative Weighting**
Week 2 – 6 Feb 2023	Week 6 – 10 March 2023		30%
Assignment title	Assignment 1		

This assessment assesses the following course learning outcomes

# as in Course Guide	UOWM KDU Penang University College Learning Outcome
CLO2	Analyse the empirical nature of software engineering and the application of empirical methods in software engineering development
CLO3	Evaluate advanced software engineering techniques and processes in the development of a software artefact.

# as in Course Guide	University of Lincoln Learning Outcome
LO2	Analyse the empirical nature of software engineering and the application of empirical methods in software engineering development
LO4	Critique current software engineering processes in safety critical system

Student's declaration

I certify that the work submitted for this assignment is my own and research sources are fully acknowledged.

Student's signature:

Date:

Dates and Mechanisms for Assessment Submission and Feedback

Mechanism for handout to students	Open Learning
Mechanism for submission of work by student	*Softcopy online submission via Open Learning*
Date by which work, feedback and marks will be returned to students	24th March 2023
Mechanism for return of assignment work, feedback and marks to students	Feedback will be provided by a marking template. This will be available to students via Open Learning. The discussions at the walkthroughs will also provide informal feedback

COURSEWORK SUBMISSION GENERAL INFORMATION

Academic Integrity Statement

You must adhere to the university college regulations on academic conduct. Formal inquiry proceedings will be instigated if there is any suspicion of plagiarism or any other form of misconduct in your work. Students must **NOT** collude with other groups of students or plagiarize their work.

Nature of the submission required

A softcopy of your assignment in **PDF version** should be submitted to lecturer, no later than the date and time stipulated on the cover sheet. In addition, an electronic copy of your work must be submitted to Turnitin. The first page of your report, immediately after the cover page, must be a page from Turnitin clearly showing your name and your Originality Score (Please refer to submission arrangement).

Diagrams may be used where they are helpful to support your arguments or description. If they are not your own work, the source must be referenced. Please help us to handle and mark your work efficiently.

Documentation guidelines

Student is required to submit a **SOFTCOPY** of the report and ensure that it use the following formatted styles: 1) Font type: **ARIAL**, 2) Font size: **11 pt**., 3) Line spacing: **Single spacing** and 4) Page layouts: **Justify**. Please make sure you have proper format alignment for all paragraphs, following standard writing style and use **HARVARD CITATION STYLE** for citation. Please include a **HEADER** with the following information: **Student ID, Student name, Course code and Assignment type**. Please also include a proper cover page for your submission which contains information about the students, assignment, course, and department with UOW Malaysia KDU Penang University College and University of Lincoln (UoL) logos on top. Also include page number and list of references, which is shown in the last page.

Penalties for Late Submission

For late submission of this Assignment, a penalty of a reduction by 10% of the maximum mark may be applicable for each Calendar Day or part thereof that the submission is late. An Assignment submitted more than **TEN** Calendar Days after the deadline will have a mark of zero recorded for this Assignment.

Submission arrangement
1. Cover page
2. Turnitin similarity report
3. Table of Content
4. Main Report
5. Reference List or Bibliography List (whichever applicable)
6. Marking Rubric (in landscape orientation)

Assignment instructions/Background

Tasks: Individual Work
You are a new software engineer who just joined a software company. The company would like you to review 2 types of software in the market as your first task. Each software has different nature of design and development.

The first software is an e-commerce website, tealive.
Refer here: https://www.tealive.com.my/

The second software is an online chat application. You may choose from one of these application:
1. WhatsApp
2. Discord
3. Telegram
4. Skype
5. WeChat

Write a report in 1,000 to 1,500 words to review the 2 software in the following scopes.

1) Software Development Methodology (300-450 words)
Based on your understanding of the 2 software's scopes, identify and explain the software development methodology which might be adopted by the software development teams who developed the 2 software. Support your choice with the strengths and weaknesses of the development process.

2) Design Review (300-450 words)
Review the scope and user interface design for each of the software. Explain the relevant areas of good design in terms of the golden rules of UI or interface design metrics which can be used to review the software. Hint: you can provide some screenshots to support your answers.

3) Software Ethics (200-300 words)

Discuss critically the effects of software ethics in the 2 software development and the importance of both software to be developed in a way that is ethical. You can cite other similar software's best practices and also refer to the IEEE ethics to support your arguments.

4) Software Sustainability & Improvement (200-300 words)

Discuss whether the 2 software could sustain in long run or at risk to fail soon. Suggest 1 area of improvement to each of the software in terms of software process methodologies or design characteristics.

Marking Rubric – Assignment 1

Section	Failed (0-49)	Third Class (50-59)	Second Class Lower (60-69)	Second Class Upper (70-79)	First Class (80-100)	Mark
Section 1: Software Development Methodology (30%) [CLO3]	No discussion or totally wrong description of software development methodologies for the 2 software.	1 of 2 software development methodology description is incorrect or both software development methodologies are described with very brief justification.	The software development methodologies are described with a few areas of justifications are unclear or incorrect.	The description of the software development methodologies for the 2 software are correct with 1-2 areas of justifications are unclear or incorrect.	The description of the software development methodologies for the 2 software are correct and the justifications are detailed and clear.	Raw mark /100 Section mark /30
Section 2: Design Review (30%) [CLO3]	No review of the scope and design aspects of the 2 software or all review areas are incorrect.	The review of the scope and design aspects of the 2 software are largely irrelevant with very limited evidence and explanations.	The review of the scope and design aspects of the 2 software are given but a few areas of scopes or design metrics are unclear or incorrect.	The review of the scope and design aspects of the 2 software are given with 1-2 areas of explanations are unclear or incorrect.	The review of the scope and design aspects of the 2 software are given and the explanations are detailed and clear with full evidence.	Raw mark /100 Section mark /30
Section 3: Software Ethics (20%) [CLO2]	No discussion on software ethics or good practices is given or all discussion are incorrect.	Only 1 of 2 software's software ethics or good practices is discussed, or both software's software ethics or good practices are discussed but largely irrelevant with very limited evidence and explanations.	The software ethics or good practices of 2 software are discussed but a few areas are unclear or incorrect, wrongly justified.	The software ethics or good practices of 2 software are discussed with 1-2 areas are unclear or incorrect, wrongly justified.	The software ethics or good practices of 2 software are discussed and the explanations are detailed and clear with full evidence.	Raw mark /100 Section mark /20
Section 4: Software Sustainability & Improvement (20%) [CLO2]	No discussion on software sustainability & improvement or all discussion are incorrect.	Only 1 of 2 software's sustainability & improvement is discussed, or both software's sustainability & improvement are discussed but irrelevant with very limited evidence and explanations.	The software's sustainability & improvement area of the 2 software are discussed but a few areas are unclear or incorrect, wrongly justified.	The software's sustainability & improvement area of the 2 software are discussed with 1-2 areas are unclear or incorrect, wrongly justified.	The software's sustainability & improvement area of the 2 software are discussed and the explanations are detailed and clear with full evidence.	Raw mark /100 Section mark /20
					Total Score:	**/100**

Written comments area: