Australian National University

COMP3530/6353 Systems Engineering for Software Engineers

Semester 1, 2017

Common Assessment Process – Tag Report

Learning Portfolio

This rubric evaluates the learning portfolio and is based on the following criteria:

- The portfolio summary demonstrates complete understanding of the topics as presented in the readings, by the lecturers, and in the tutorials
- Each topic is thoroughly analysed to identify assumptions made in the readings, lectures and tutorials. Weakness and strengths of the ideas presented are discussed in insightful ways. Alternative views are identified and compared.
- Insightful connections are made between topics presented in the course, other courses and personal experiences forming a coherent view of systems engineering
- The learning portfolio is well organised and is free of grammatical, spelling and citation errors.

Student name and ID

Name ___Tiange Wang_____ ID ____u5715141_____

Tags

Please complete the following sentences by selecting appropriate words or phrases. Select as many words or phrases as are applicable. Please also provide feedback to help students improve.

The portfolio **summary** can be described as:

[ ]	Engaging	[ ]	Adequate	[ ]	Perceptive	[ ]	Irrelevant
[ ]	Demonstrating little real understanding	[ ]	Demonstrating an integrated and holistic view	[ ]	Relevant	[ ]	Drawn out & tedious

[ ] Other _____

Provide feedback for improvement and explanation for your selections above

Not always clear just how deep any understanding went or whether it was a simple summary of the topics and associated concepts.

The **analysis** of each topic can be described as:

[ ]	Developing	[ ]	Incomplete	[ ]	Insightful	[ ]	Exploring the student's understanding
[ ]	Considering alternative views	[ ]	Providing rationale and critique	[ ]	Linking different perspectives	[ ]	Inadequate with few supporting examples

[ ] Other _____

Provide feedback for improvement and explanation for your selections above

Largely descriptive rather than analytic. However, when you are analytic, such as in human error, your analysis is rather simplistic and only considers the issues from a single point of view. For example, you imply that the "system" (i.e. the mechanised, computerised operation of the roller-coaster ride, excluding the humans involved) never exhibits an error. Do you think that the experience of the human operators may have been that frequently, and in error the system tells them there is a stuck train? And that consequently they have learned to ignore the system, except when they know through human advice that it might be correct? The swiss cheese model of error analysis, suggests that it was a series of errors and that unfortunately all the errors lined up on that particular day.

The **connections** between topics and ideas in the portfolio can be described as:

[ ]	Inspiring	[ ]	Simple	[ ]	Largely non-existent	[ ]	Convincing
[ ]	Relevant	[ ]	Well-developed	[ ]	Synthesising ideas & experiences	[ ]	Difficult to understand

[ ] Other

_____

Provide feedback for improvement and explanation for your selections above

While connections are evident, they are simplistic and generally without sufficient explanation and examples to support them and make them meaningful. For example, in cyber security you hint at the connection to systems thinking when putting for your opinion that a we could "use 'fixes that fail' system to design a more efficient and safe solution when the company and employees encounter some issues" but do not provide any explanation of how this might help, nor do you provide an example that may have helped the reader to understand without an explanation.

The **presentation** and **organisation** of the portfolio can be categorized as:

[ ]	Simple and straightforward	[ ]	Clear and concise	[ ]	Coherent & logical	[ ]	Disorganised & rambling
[ ]	Missing citations and references	[ ]	Showing a lack of proof reading & inconsistent citation/referencing	[ ]	Having minimal grammatical and spelling errors & mostly consistent citation/referencing	[ ]	Free from grammatical, spelling and citation errors
[ ]	Thorough	[ ]	Mixed effort	[ ]	Insufficient material	[ ]	Appropriate

[ ] Other _____

Provide feedback for improvement and explanation for your selections above

Well presented. Some typographical and grammatical errors that sometimes made it difficult to be certain of your meaning.

You must use in-text citation when you include images, diagrams and tables, just as you must do when you use someone else's ideas and words and then include the citations in a reference list. This means, that at the very least you should have been citing and referencing the lectures ☹

Any other feedback or comments you wish to provide