University of Central Lancashire UCLan Department of Computer Science	**UCLan Coursework Assessment Brief**	2023-2024
	Module Title: The Computing Challenge	
	Module Code: CO1111	Level 4
	Individual Portfolio	This assessment is worth 70% of the overall module mark

THE BRIEF / INSTRUCTIONS

The following learning outcomes will be assessed:

1. With tutor assistance, plan and develop an interactive computing related product in a team environment.
2. Design, discuss and evaluate a user interface for a computer application.
3. Discuss the business context in which computer applications are developed.
4. Prepare and present material in an academic style, identifying relevant academic references and using them to support an argument.

Submit a **REPORT** which follows the provided **TEMPLATE**, complete with the following sections:

1. **Introduction**
   About 150 words. In the introduction you should explain a bit of background about The Computing Challenge.
2. **Week 1 Lab Sheet Documentation**
   Document one of the individual lab sheets from Week 1. This can either be labsheet 1 or 2. Include a screenshot of the blocks and your screen.
3. **Agile Methodology**
   a) Stand Up Meeting
      Document one of your stand up meetings.
   b) Agile Techniques
      Discuss Agile Software Development Techniques, referencing any sources used. Include a link to your Kanban board.
4. **Design**
   a) App UI Design and UX
      Discuss the UI design of your app. Refer to design/UX theories and reference the sources used.
   b) System Design
      Discuss the system design. This section should include a State Transition Diagram.
5. **App Implementation**
   Document the implementation of your app. Include samples of the block code with explanations of how the different parts work.
6. **Marketing Strategy**
   Present your teams marketing strategy. Include a link to your Viral Video.
7. **Testing**
   Document your testing strategy. Present and evaluate your results. Reflect on the testing that was carried out.
8. **The Symposium**
   Discuss the symposium. Include discussion of your own teams stall/app, as well as a favourite stall/app of another team. Illustrate with photos from the day.
9. **Teamwork Reflection**
   Reflect on your team work. Evaluate what went well, what didn't go so well, what you would do differently next time. Include references within your discussion.
10. **References**
    List the references that you have cited in Harvard format.
    See the Assignment template for more detail on each section

IMPORTANT: You **CANNOT PASS** this assignment without the team having submitted their final app and presented at the Computing Challenge symposium. There is no separate mark for that app.

PREPARATION FOR THE ASSESSMENT

a) Complete all the tasks from all worksheets, to ensure you understand the concepts and techniques.
b) Ask questions in class to clarify anything you do not understand.
c) Do the work in plenty of time before the deadline so that we can provide some feedback within labs.

RELEASE DATES AND HAND IN DEADLINE

Assessment Release date: [02/10/2023]
Assessment Deadline Date and time: **[10/11/2023 at 11:59 PM]**

Please note that this is the final time you can submit – not the time to submit!
Your feedback / feed forward and mark for this assessment will be provided within 15 working days.

THE SUBMISSION

Submit a well-written, spell-checked and grammar-checked report that meets the brief instructions and includes relevant references using Harvard formatting. The assignment will be submitted through Blackboard to TurnItIn.

Submission will be through Blackboard. The links are in the Assignments tab of the CO1111 Blackboard space.

You must also complete and add the cover sheet (separate document on Blackboard) to your assignment submission. You can only submit one document, so you need to copy, paste, and complete it as the first page.

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSED BY THIS WORK

1. With tutor assistance, plan and develop an interactive computing related product in a team environment.
2. Design, discuss and evaluate a user interface for a computer application.
3. Discuss the business context in which computer applications are developed.
4. Prepare and present material in an academic style, identifying relevant academic references and using them to support an argument.

MARKING CRITERIA

	Fail	Third Class	Lower 2nd Class	Upper 2nd Class	First Class
Introduction (5%)	Little or no effort has gone into writing an introduction.	Brief and simplistic introduction, may contain spelling and or grammatical errors.	Brief introduction, minimal spelling or grammatical errors, a reasonable level of detail.	A detailed introduction free from most spelling or grammatical errors.	A thoughtful, well written and detailed introduction free from spelling or grammatical errors.
Week 1 Lab Sheet (10%)	Little or no effort has gone into this section, it does not adequately demonstrate understanding of the lab work completed.	The section shows basic understanding of the lab work completed. There may be some isolated significant flaws or mistakes.	The section shows a fair understanding of the lab work completed. There should be no major flaws or mistakes though your explanation could be more detailed.	This section shows a good understanding of the lab work completed. There are no mistakes, and it is.	This section shows good understanding of the lab work completed, but also goes beyond the basics, showing deep understanding of the code.
Agile Methodology (10%)	Little or no effort has gone into this section, it does not adequately demonstrate understanding of the Agile Methodology. Documentation of Stand-Up and Kanban is missing or flawed. No references.	The section shows basic understanding of the Agile methodology. There may be some flaws and/or misunderstandings. Documentation of Stand-Up and Kanban is adequate though may be incomplete or contain minor flaws. No references.	The section shows a fair understanding of the Agile methodology. There should be no major misunderstandings. Documentation of Stand-Up and Kanban is reasonable although could have been more detailed. An attempt has been made at referencing, with flawed referencing style or poor sources.	The section shows a good understanding of the Agile methodology. Documentation of Stand-Up and Kanban is detailed. Referencing has been used without significant errors and to well-chosen sources which strengthen the students' arguments.	The section shows an excellent understanding of the Agile methodology. Documentation of Stand-Up and Kanban is detailed. Referencing has been used without any errors and to a range of well-chosen sources which significantly strengthen the students' arguments.

Design (10%)	Little or no effort has gone into documenting the design, it does not adequately demonstrate understanding of design theories. Sketches/wireframes and STD are missing or flawed.	The section shows adequate documentation of the design and attempts to bring in at least one piece of theory. An adequate attempt to present Sketches/wireframes and STD. No references.	The section shows a fair understanding of design theories. Documentation of the UI and System design is reasonable although could have been more detailed. An attempt has been made at referencing, with flawed referencing style or poor sources.	The section shows a good understanding of design theories. Documentation of the UI and System design is also good. Referencing has been used without significant errors and to well-chosen sources which strengthen the students' arguments.	The section shows an excellent understanding of design theories. Documentation of the UI and System design is also superbly detailed. Referencing has been used without any errors and to a range of well-chosen sources which strengthen the students' arguments.
Implementation (10%)	Little or no effort has gone into documenting the implementation, it does not adequately demonstrate understanding of the code.	This section shows a basic understanding of the code. There may be flaws and misunderstandings, or the student may have chosen trivial aspects to focus on.	This section shows a fair understanding of the code. Documentation of the code is reasonable, student has focused on significant aspects of the code, although this could have been more detailed.	This section shows a good understanding of the code. Documentation of the code is good with clear explanations. Student has focused their effort on significant aspects of the code and have included appropriate detail.	This section shows an excellent understanding of the code. Documentation of the code is thorough with clear explanations of the challenges involved. Student has focused their effort on significant aspects of the code and avoided documenting trivial details.
Marketing (10%)	Little or no effort has gone into documenting the marketing strategy. viral video is missing or flawed.	This section shows adequate documentation of the marketing strategy and viral video. Lacking detail.	This section includes reasonable documentation of the marketing strategy and viral video. An attempt has been made to evaluate some of the choices that have been made.	This section includes detailed documentation of the marketing strategy and viral video. A reasonable evaluation of the video and the choices has been made.	This section includes detailed documentation of the marketing strategy and viral video. A detailed and thoughtful evaluation of the video and the choices has been made.
Testing (10%)	Little or no effort has gone into documenting the testing. Test strategy, results and evaluation are missing or flawed.	This section shows adequate documentation of the testing. However, the test strategy may be poorly justified, and/or detail may be lacking. Minimal or no evaluation.	This section includes a fair documentation of the testing. The test strategy is reasonably designed and justified. There is some evaluation, which mostly focuses on significant findings.	This section includes a detailed documentation of the testing. The test strategy is well designed and justified. There is a detailed evaluation focussing on significant findings.	This section includes a detailed documentation of the testing. The test strategy is well designed and justified. There is a detailed evaluation focussing on significant findings with evidence of test results and discussion of how problems were solved.
Symposium (10%)	Little or no effort has gone into this section. Documentation & discussion of the symposium is missing or flawed.	This section shows adequate documentation of the student's participation in the symposium but is lacking in detail.	This section includes a fair discussion of the student's participation in the symposium. This should include some photographs and comments on strengths and weaknesses found in other teams' stalls, as well as a brief evaluation of their own teams' stall.	This section includes a reasonable detailed discussion of the student's participation in the symposium. There is some reasonable evaluation of their own stall along with discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of other team's stalls. Section is well documented with photographs.	This section includes a highly detailed discussion of the student's participation in the symposium. There is a detailed and thoughtful evaluation of their own stall along with discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of other team's stalls. Section is well documented with photographs.
Reflection (15%)	Little or no effort has gone into this section and reflecting on the work that was carried out. No references	This section shows an adequate reflection on the student's participation in the computing challenge, but there is a lack of detail. No references.	This section shows a fair reflection on the student's participation in the computing challenge. Could be more detailed. An attempt has been made at referencing, with flawed referencing style or poor sources.	This section shows a detailed and thoughtful reflection on the student's participation in the computing challenge. Referencing has been used without significant errors and to well-chosen sources which strengthen the students' arguments.	This section shows a highly detailed and thoughtful reflection on the student's participation in all aspects the computing challenge. They should reflect on how the experience will shape them as students going forward. Referencing has been used without significant errors and to well-chosen sources which strengthen the students' arguments.
References (10%)	Little or no attempt at referencing.	No referencing at all or is so significantly flawed as to not be meaningful.	A fair attempt has been made at referencing, with minor flaws in the referencing style and/or poor sources.	A good attempt has been made at referencing, with no flaws in the referencing style and mostly well-chosen sources from a range of literature.	An excellent attempt has been made at referencing. Referencing style is accurate and consistent throughout. Student has considered a wide range of literature and chosen their sources carefully.

IMPORTANT: You CANNOT PASS this assignment without the team having presented their final app at the Computing Challenge symposium. There is no separate mark for the app.

HELP AND SUPPORT

- Support will be provided via Microsoft Teams and email. You will also have the opportunity to ask questions during lectures / labs. You may request a one to one meeting with a tutor during their office hours (as published on Starfish).
- For support with using library resources, please contact our subject librarian subjectlibrarians@uclan.ac.uk. You will find links to lots of useful resources in the My Library tab on Blackboard.
- If you have not yet made the university aware of any disability, specific learning difficulty, long-term health or mental health condition, please let us know. The Inclusive Support team will then contact you to discuss reasonable adjustments and support relating to any disability. For more information, visit the Inclusive Support site.
- To access mental health and wellbeing support, please complete our online referral form. Alternatively, you can email wellbeing@uclan.ac.uk, call 01772 893020 or visit our UCLan Wellbeing Service pages for more information.
- If you have any other query or require further support you can contact The Student Support Centre. Speak with us for advice on accessing all the University services as well as the Library services. Whatever your query, our expert staff will be able to help and support you. For more information, how to contact us and our opening hours visit Student Support Centre.
- If you have any valid mitigating circumstances that mean you cannot meet an assessment submission deadline and you wish to request an extension, you will need to apply online prior to the deadline.

Disclaimer: The information provided in this assessment brief is correct at time of publication. In the unlikely event that any changes are deemed necessary, they will be communicated clearly via e-mail and a new version of this assessment brief will be circulated.	Version: 2 Updated 01/09/2022