

Your Name: COMP1682 Initial Contextual Report

Your Project Title

Your Name 000123456

Supervisor: Your Supervisor's Name

Initial Contextual Report

COMP1682 Final Year Project

Programme Title, e.g. Computing

Due date:

Word count:

Abstract

This is where you succinctly describe your project, the context of and interest in your project, your approach to your project and your progress to date using somewhere between 60 and 120 words. This is much easier to write after you have written the rest of this report.

1 Table of Contents

1	Table of Contents	2
2	Introduction	3
2.1	<i>Background</i>	3
2.2	<i>Aims and objectives</i>	3
2.3	<i>Approach</i>	3
3	Literature Review	3
3.1	<i>Approach to literature searching</i>	3
3.2	<i>Identifying the problem</i>	3
3.3	<i>Another Section</i>	3
3.4	<i>Yet Another Section</i>	3
3.5	<i>Conclusions</i>	4
4	Product Research	
4.1	Review/Comparison	
5	Legal, Social, Ethical and Professional Issues and Considerations	4
6	<i>Requirements</i>	4
6.1	<i>Analysis of requirements</i>	4
6.2	<i>Requirements elicitation</i>	4
6.3	<i>Functional requirements</i>	4
6.4	<i>Non-functional requirements</i>	5
7	<i>Design</i>	5
8	<i>Prototype</i>	5
8.1	<i>Review of technology</i>	5
9	<i>Bibliography</i>	5
10	<i>Appendices</i>	5

**optional chapters*

2 Introduction

2.1 Background

You have already written this in your proposal. This is an opportunity to improve on your original text.

2.2 Aims and objectives

You have already documented these in your proposal. This is your opportunity to state why you have changed your mind and provide revised objectives

2.3 Approach

Again, you have already discussed this in your proposal but you may wish to restate this now that you are older and wiser. The key here is to realistically describe your approach and avoid regurgitating tedious guff about DSDM or some other branded 'methodology' when your approach is truthfully just making it up as you go along and keeping your fingers crossed.

2.4 Justification of the suitability of a Methodology or a Framework followed.

3 Literature Review

3.1 Approach to literature searching

Discuss where you have looked and what you have looked for.

3.2 Identifying the problem

This will hopefully expand what you have looked for into what you have found

3.3 Another Section

This is not a review of technology; it should be a review of literature. Do not simply summarise each source in sequence. Some published literature reviews are actually literature catalogues, for example Portocarrero et al. (2014). While these are useful documents this is not what we are looking for here. Your literature review should not be a compilation of facts and feelings but a coherent argument that leads into the description of the proposed study (Rudestam & Newton, 2007, p. 47). According to Rudestam & Newton (2007, p. 48) a common misunderstanding is that a literature review is a "*laundry list of previous studies with sentences or paragraphs beginning with words such as Smith found that... or Jones concluded that ...*". Use a tool to manage and automatically generate your bibliography. I have used APA 6th edition to provide formatting that is remarkably similar to the Greenwich Harvard specification.

3.4 Yet Another Section

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip

ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

3.5 Conclusions

What are you taking forward from this? How is this going to influence what you are going to do next?

4 Product Research

4.1 Comparing of similar products or platforms against a set criteria for Usability purpose.

5 Legal, Social, Ethical and Professional Issues and Considerations

You may find it helpful to include a list of all applicable laws and perhaps other laws that you have considered and excluded, with reasons why they do not apply, if appropriate. It is generally not a good idea to decompose this section into sections labelled as 'Legal', 'Social', and so on as these aspects are intimately related.

6 Requirements

6.1 Analysis of requirements

In this project there are of....

6.2 Comparison of systems

For some projects there may be similar existing systems. This would be a good place to identify these, compare them and elicit requirements from them.

6.3 Requirements elicitation

Perhaps you have conducted some actual research with questionnaires and interviews and such like (having obtained research ethics clearance of course). This would be a good place to discuss this.

6.4 Functional requirements

A clear statement of functional requirements is the starting point for your design. Without this you will look foolish.

6.5 Non-functional requirements

Clear statement of non-functional requirements. It may be an idea here to refer back to your earlier LSEPi section as compliance is likely to (and should) be an important aspect here.

7 Design

Describe your approach to design. If perhaps you are using UML use-case notation then the line between requirements and design starts to blur (Šilingas & Butleris, 2015). Other UML notation is however part of the design process, but perhaps overlaps with testing.

8 Prototype

Describe your approach to creating your first (and second and third) prototype(s).

8.1 Review of technology

If you need to review technologies this is perhaps the place to do it. Perhaps you need a data base, in which case state what database engines have you considered, which have you decided to use and for what reason. Perhaps you need an app, in which case you could, for example, state which development frameworks are available, compare and contrast all, select 3 for detailed comparison, choose one and state why you have made this choice.

9 Reflection

Wrap the whole thing up with some conclusions. A reflective approach is increasingly popular but many students struggle with introducing a critical personal perspective (Day, 2013).

10 Bibliography

- Day, T. (2013). *Success in Academic Writing*. Palgrave.
- Portocarrero, J. M., Delicato, F. C., Pires, P. F., Gámez, N., Fuentes, L., Ludovino, D., & Ferreira, P. (2014). Autonomic Wireless Sensor Networks: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Sensors*.
- Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2007). *Surviving Your Dissertation: A Comprehensive Guide to Content and Process* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Šilingas, D., & Butleris, R. (2015). Towards implementing a framework for modeling software requirements in MagicDraw UML. *Information Technology and Control*, 38(2).

11 Appendices