Coventry University

Student Assignment Brief

This document is intended for Coventry University Group students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module. It must not be passed to third parties or posted on any website. If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact your Module Leader.

Contents:

The work you submit for this assignment must be your own independent work, or in the case of a group assignment your own groups' work. More information is available in the 'Assignment Task' section of this assignment brief.

Assignment Information

Module Name: Advanced Software Development

Module Code: 7003SCN

Assignment Title: Software project portfolio (including group work evaluation and individual reports, practical software development work, individual peer assessment)

Assignment Due: 15 December 2025, 18:00 UK time

For assessments that are submitted through Turnitin, the University allows a 24-hour grace period for receipt of submission. Therefore, submission will only be accepted up until 16 December 2025 by 18.00hrs. This should NOT be viewed as extra time to complete the assessment but is provided to allow for any unforeseen technical issues that may occur around the submission deadline, especially when Turnitin is handling large numbers of submissions.

Please note that this assessment is/is not eligible for an extension. Please note there is no grade period for extensions.

If you do not pass this assessment you may have an opportunity to resit it. If you do need to resit, you will be asked to use the feedback provided to revise your original submission, so that it meets the pass requirements for the module. You must clearly indicate the changes you have made in the new

This document is intended for Coventry University Group students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module. It must not be passed to third parties or posted on any website.

Page 1 of 11

submission. Please check your SOLAR results and the submission links on your Aula module page to see when the resit is due.

The re-assessment is by improving on the original assessment based on feedback with reflection.

Resit 1: the date and time for the submission of your resit/deferral is 5 March 2026 18:00 UK time. For resit/deferral assessments that are submitted through Turnitin, the University allows a 24-hour grace period for receipt of submissions. Therefore, your resit/deferral submission will only be accepted up until 6 March 2026 by 18.00hrs.

Resit 2: the date and time for the submission of your resit/deferral is 23 April 2026 18:00 UK time. For resit/deferral assessments that are submitted through Turnitin, the University allows a 24-hour grace period for receipt of submissions. Therefore, your resit/deferral submission will only be accepted up until 24 April 2026 by 18.00hrs.

Assignment Credit: 30 credits

Word Count (or equivalent): 5000 words [+/- 10%] plus a video of 10 minutes [+/- 10%] (excluding references and appendices)

You should state your word count at the end of written work. If you exceed the word limit by more than 10% (i.e. if you exceed 5500 then your work will only be read up to the allocated limit.

Assignment Type: Cw

Percentage Grade (Applied Core Assessment). You will be provided with an overall grade between 0% and 100%. You have one opportunity to pass the assignment at or above 40%.

This document is intended for Coventry University Group students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module. It must not be passed to third parties or posted on any website.

Page 2 of 11

Assignment Task

Tasks and assessment criteria	Weighting
Group and individual reports	**90%** mark

1   Software Project Leadership and Entrepreneurship (Group Evaluation)
    1.1 As a group, report on the agile approach to team leadership, project risks and social, legal, and ethical consideration. (Note: the agile project should be supported by the evidence of using agile software.) (Note: the team should clearly list each team member's contribution in this section.). [15**%** mark]
    1.2 As a group, report on the most significant work completed by the team to demonstrate the level of quality, complexity, creativity for entrepreneurship with evidence in the following areas: [15% mark]
    • Design (giving evidence of models and diagrams related to data and functionality in screen shots)
    • Implementation (giving evidence of source code examples with annotations to explain the code in screen shots)
    • Testing (giving test cases and results in screen shots) for usability according to international quality standards
    • Supporting evidence of a 10-minute demo video for the best working software features with live data. (Note: at the beginning of the video, the team should clearly list each team member's contribution in the video and individual's critical appraisal of entrepreneurial characteristics and the leadership style adopted during the process)
 	
2   Leadership and Entrepreneurship (Individual Evaluation Reports)
    2.1 As an individual, critically evaluate and report on the principles and practice for leading a team and developing people considering the following areas:
    (Note: each report should be signed off by the respective individual team member) [30**%** mark]
    • The influence of leadership, culture and development on performance
    • The strategies which promote engagement and wellbeing as an enabler of individual and team performance
    • A proposal of a leadership development strategy which values people whilst optimising team and organisational success
    (*Note: the strategy proposal is to be included in an appendix and excluded from the word count)
 	
    2.2 As an individual, critically evaluate and report on the theoretical concepts and contemporary thinking in entrepreneurial practice of how an idea, from concept to delivery, is developed based on the scenario selected by the team. Take into account forms and strategic contexts of entrepreneurial practice and consideration of the following to achieve a successful outcome in the target group project scenario. (Note: each report should be signed off by the respective individual team member.) [30% mark]
    • Addressing the multi-dimensional issues which impact on entrepreneurial practice
    • Suggesting ways of overcoming barriers to entrepreneurial practice, using an evidence-based approach including proposing a course of action to achieve an entrepreneurial aim (* Note to be included in an appendix and excluded from the word count)
    • Identify the characteristics and attributes of entrepreneurial leadership for achieving outcomes
 	
Note: the above report sections should be supported by appropriate in-text citations in the CU APA referencing style.	

3   Individual peer assessment
 	
    3.1 As an individual, give a rating of 0-10 (10 as the highest score) and feedback for each of the other team member's contribution to the overall team project.
    3.2 As an individual, critically reflect on your own contribution to identify development needs for future leadership role in an entrepreneurial practice context.
	10% mark

Total:	**100% mark**

Additional notes:

1. You will undertake a project in a team of 5 members for full-stack development of a software product of your choice (including the technologies, platforms or programming languages agreed by the team). Your team should carry out market research on the existing software products and deliver appropriate software solutions to a real-world scenario agreed by the team.

2. As a team member, you should ensure that you contribute to the different aspects of software project, including design, implementation and testing.

3. The assessment is in the Amber category for use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

   Amber - AI Used to assist

   You are expected to acknowledge any AI tools you have in your research process, and you must cite and reference any generated AI related information in the individual written report using the Coventry University American Psychological Association (APA) referencing style.

4. The report should be supported by research with appropriate referencing using the CU APA referencing style.

5. *The leadership and development strategy proposal (2.1) and proposed course of action (2.2) are to be included in the appendices and will form part of the overall assessment.

   The contents of these individual reports also address the Chartered Management Institute (CMI) Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs); the word count guidance for each report is 1750 words with a relevant appendix. Each appendix is excluded from the word count.

Submission Instructions:

Please see the details of how to submit the assignment here.

1. The method of submission is an online submission on aula via the links given in the Assignments area.

2. Formatting of submission:

   - Written report (including group work evaluation, individual reports and software development work evidence) format: a Microsoft Word document

   - Demo of working software features as a group: a 10-min video (in the MP4 format)

   - Individual peer assessment format: a Microsoft Word document

   You are expected to acknowledge the generative AI contents you have used in your research process, and you must cite and reference any information generated by AI in individual written report using the Coventry University APA style.

You should include a summary of where and how you used AI tools at the end of your work before your reference list. This could include the adaptation of the following table:

Tool	How used in this assignment
e.g. ChatGPT-3.5	Key word search on topics related to learning outcomes
e.g. Microsoft Copilot	Summarising documents as part of background research

This document is intended for Coventry University Group students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module. It must not be passed to third parties or posted on any website.

Page 4 of 11

Academic staff will not be responsible for removing submissions that are made in error. Therefore, please take care in checking your submission before uploading to the final assessment submission link. You may submit multiple times to the final assessment link but do remember that obtaining a similarity report may take up to 24 hours and this should not be attempted close to the deadline. You may also utilise the draft link in the community pages for checking your similarity scores prior to the deadline.

If you experience any technical problems when trying to submit your work, please consult Aula help via the question mark link. If these problems are experienced at the time of the submission deadline and cannot be quickly resolved, please capture screenshots as evidence and email these and your completed assessment to the module leader as soon as possible. Whilst this cannot be marked it could be used as evidence that you've gained no time advantage on your work should this be needed for an appeal.

Development of Skills and Attributes:

The module and assessment will develop specific Graduate Attributes. The mapping of Graduate Attributes to the assessment tasks are indicated as follows:

- Communicate effectively (CE): mapped to assessment task 1, 2 and 3
- Act with integrity (AI): mapped to assessment task 1, 2 and 3
- Adapt approach (AA): mapped to assessment task 1, 2 and 3
- Think creatively (TC): mapped to assessment task 1, 2 and 3
- Get things done (GD): mapped to assessment task 1, 2 and 3

Marking and Feedback

How will my assignment be marked?

Your assignment will be marked by the module team.

How will I receive my grades and feedback?

Provisional marks will be released once internally moderated.

Feedback will be provided by the module team alongside grades release.

The students can access their feedback via the submission link, along with the marks.

Your provisional marks and feedback should be available within two weeks after the extension submission date.

What will I be marked against?

Details of the marking criteria for this task can be found at the bottom of this assignment brief.

This document is intended for Coventry University Group students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module. It must not be passed to third parties or posted on any website.

Page 5 of 11

Assessed Module Learning Outcomes

The Learning Outcomes for this module align to the <u>marking criteria</u> which can be found at the end of this brief. Ensure you understand the marking criteria to ensure successful achievement of the assessment task. The following module learning outcomes (LOs) are assessed in this task:

1. Evaluate and apply an appropriate approach to managing a software project in a teamworking environment, to meet the given requirements and constraints

2. Evaluate and apply appropriate technologies, tools and techniques to the design and development of a software product for a target problem domain

3. Apply appropriate testing strategies and quality assurance according to international standards

4. Critically evaluate the leadership and entrepreneurial practice conducted in the team's software project

5. Demonstrate practice consistent with social, legal, and ethical awareness according to applicable professional codes of conduct e.g. British Computer Society (BCS)

In addition, this module includes the four learning outcomes from the Chartered Management Institute Level 7 Strategic Management and Leadership Practice qualification syllabus 2024, units 702 Leading and Developing People to Optimise Performance and 711 Entrepreneurial Practice as follows:

Unit 702 Leading and Developing People to Optimise Performance

CMI 1 Understand the principles for leading and developing people

CMI 2 Understand leadership and development strategy

Unit 711 Entrepreneurial Practice

CMI 1 Understand the principles of entrepreneurial practice

CMI 2 Understand entrepreneurship in strategic context

Assignment Support and Academic Integrity

If you have any questions about this assignment please see the <u>Student Guidance on Coursework</u> for more information.

Spelling, Punctuation, and Grammar:

You are expected to use effective, accurate, and appropriate language within this assessment task.

Academic Integrity:

The work you submit must be your own, or in the case of groupwork, that of your group. All sources of information need to be acknowledged and attributed; therefore, you must provide references for all sources of information and acknowledge any tools used in the production of your work, including Artificial Intelligence (AI). We use detection software and make routine checks for evidence of academic misconduct.

It is your responsibility to keep a record of how your thinking has developed as you progress through to submission. Appropriate evidence could include: version controlled documents, developmental sketchbooks, or journals. This evidence can be called upon if we suspect academic misconduct.

If using Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in the development of your assignment, you must reference which tools you have used and for what purposes you have used them. This information must be acknowledged in your final submission.

Definitions of academic misconduct, including plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and collusion can be found <u>on the Student Portal</u>. All cases of suspected academic misconduct are referred for investigation, the outcomes of which can have profound consequences to your studies. For more information on academic integrity please visit the <u>Academic and Research Integrity</u> section of the Student Portal.

Support for Students with Disabilities or Additional Needs:

If you have a disability, long-term health condition, specific learning difference, mental health diagnosis or symptoms and have discussed your support needs with health and wellbeing you may be able to access support that will help with your studies.

If you feel you may benefit from additional support, but have not disclosed a disability to the University, or have disclosed but are yet to discuss your support needs it is important to let us know so we can provide the right support for your circumstances. Visit <u>the Student Portal</u> to find out more.

Unable to Submit on Time?

The University wants you to do your best. However, we know that sometimes events happen which mean that you cannot submit your assessment by the deadline or sit a scheduled exam. If you think this might be the case, guidance on understanding what counts as an extenuating circumstance, and how to apply is <u>available on the Student Portal.</u>

This document is intended for Coventry University Group students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module. It must not be passed to third parties or posted on any website.

Page 7 of 11

Administration of Assessment

Module Leader Name:

Module Leader Email:

Assignment Category: Portfolio

Attempt Type: Normal

Component Code: Cw

This document is intended for Coventry University Group students for their own use in completing their assessed work for this module. It should not be passed to third parties or posted on any website.

Page 8 of 11

Assessment Marking Criteria

	Fail 0 to 29%	Fail 30, 35%	40 to 49%	50 to 59%	60 to 69%	70 to 79%	80 to 100%
(Group Evaluation) 1.1 Group report of software project management and related issues Weighting: 15%	Outcomes not met. Minimal understanding of agile given general discussion of agile concepts only, no discussion of specific agile roles for leadership within the team; no discussion of specific techniques (for requirements, planning and tracking). Minimal understanding of social, legal, and ethical awareness and project risks in general with no reference to any professional codes or guidelines, for general software projects only, with no list each team member's contribution. No appropriate in-text citations and references.	Outcomes not met. Limited understanding of agile with discussion of techniques only, limited to the description of agile roles for leadership within the team and description of specific techniques (for requirements, planning and tracking). Limited understanding of social, legal, and ethical awareness and project risks with some references to professional codes and guidelines, for general software projects only, with no list each team member's contribution. No appropriate in-text citations and references.	Outcomes met. Basic understanding, of agile concepts and techniques applied to the group project work, limited discussion of agile roles for leadership within the team; limited number of specific techniques (for requirements, planning and tracking) with limited use of an agile management tool. Basic understanding of social, legal, and ethical awareness and project risks in relation to the team's software project but lacking examples of relevant professional codes and guidelines, including a list of each team member's contribution. Include appropriate and relevant in-text citations and references.	Good understanding of agile concepts and techniques applied to the group project work, good discussion of agile roles for leadership within the team; with a good number of applications for specific techniques (for requirements, planning and tracking) using an agile management tool to a good level. Good understanding of social, legal, and ethical awareness and project risks with examples of relevant professional codes and guidelines for some of the areas, in relation to the team's software project, including a list of each team member's contribution. No appropriate in-text citations and references. Include appropriate and relevant in-text citations and references.	Very good understanding of agile concepts and techniques applied to the group project work, very good discussion of agile roles for leadership within the team; with the application of specific techniques for most of the areas (for requirements, planning and tracking) using an agile management tool to a very good level. Very good understanding of social, legal, and ethical awareness and project risks with examples of relevant professional codes and guidelines for most of the areas, in relation to the team's software project, including a list of each team member's contribution. Include appropriate and relevant in-text citations and references.	Excellent evaluation of agile concepts and techniques applied to the group project work, excellent discussion and examples of agile roles for leadership within the team; with the application of the scrum framework, and specific techniques in all areas (for requirements, planning and tracking) using an agile management tool to an excellent level, with an evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses. Excellent understanding of social, legal, and ethical awareness and project risks with examples of relevant professional codes and guidelines for all areas, including their strengths and weaknesses in relation to the team's software project, including a list of each team member's contribution. Include appropriate and relevant in-text citations and references.	Exceptional evaluation of agile concepts and techniques applied to the group project work, exceptional discussion and examples of agile roles for leadership within the team; with the application of the scrum framework, and specific techniques in all areas (for requirements, planning and tracking) using an agile management tool to an excellent level, including an evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses with recommendations. of the areas for improvements. Exceptional understanding of social, legal, and ethical awareness and project risks with examples of relevant professional codes and guidelines for all areas, including strengths and weaknesses in relation to the team's software project, plus recommendations of the areas for improvements, including a list of each team member's contribution.

							Include appropriate and relevant in-text citations and references.
(Group Evaluation) 1.2 Group report of software development Weighting: 15%	Outcomes not met. Minimal work to demonstrate entrepreneurship in the teamwork. The design in descriptions only (no evidence of design related to data or functionality modelling). Minimal implementation, in descriptions only (no evidence of source code examples). Minimal usability testing, in descriptions only (no evidence of test cases and test results). No supporting evidence of a demo video of working software features. No list of each team member's contribution in the demo video individually; Minimal descriptive account of teamwork.	Outcomes not met. Limited work to demonstrate entrepreneurship in the teamwork. The design evidence but not related to data or functionality modelling. Limited implementation, screen shots of program outputs only (no evidence of source code examples). Limited usability testing, few screen shots of front-end testing only (limited evidence of test cases but no test results). No supporting evidence of a demo video of working software features. No list of each team member's contribution in the demo video individually; Descriptive account of teamwork	Outcomes met Basic work to demonstrate entrepreneurship in the teamwork at a low level of quality, complexity and creativity). The design (evidence data or functionality modelling, with a brief and high-level view of the design). Basic implementation (evidence of source code examples no annotation). Basic usability testing (simple examples of test cases and test results).. Supported by evidence of a demo video of working software features, including list of each team member's contribution in the demo video individually, with descriptive with some critical appraisal of teamwork.	Good work to demonstrate entrepreneurship in the teamwork at a good level of quality, complexity and creativity). The design (including evidence of design for data and functionality modelling and details in some areas of the design). Good implementation (including evidence of source code examples with annotation). Good usability testing (including good examples of test cases, and test results). Supported by evidence of a demo video of working software features, including list of each team member's contribution in the demo video individually, with good critical appraisal of teamwork	Very good work to demonstrate entrepreneurship in the teamwork at a very good level of quality, complexity and creativity). The design (including evidence of data and functionality modelling, and details in most areas of the design). Very good implementation (including evidence of source code examples with annotation). Very good usability testing (including very good examples of test cases and test results at a very good level of complexity). Supported by evidence of a demo video of working software features, including list of each team member's contribution in the demo video individually, with very good critical appraisal of teamwork.	Excellent work to demonstrate entrepreneurship in the teamwork at an excellent level of quality, complexity and creativity). The design (including evidence of data and functionality modelling, and details in all areas of the design). Excellent implementation (including evidence of source code examples with annotation). Excellent usability testing (including excellent examples of test cases, and test results at an excellent good level of complexity). Supported by evidence of a demo video of working software features, including list of each team member's contribution in the demo video individually, with excellent critical appraisal of teamwork	Exceptional work to demonstrate entrepreneurship in the teamwork at an exceptional level of quality, complexity and creativity). The design (including evidence of data and functionality modelling, and a variety of different modelling techniques with details). Exceptional implementation (including evidence of source code examples with the use of advanced concepts and technologies with annotation). Exceptional usability testing (including different examples of test cases and test results at an exceptional level of complexity). Supported by evidence of a demo video of working software features, including list of each team member's contribution in the demo video individually, with Insightful, exceptional level of critical appraisal of teamwork.

(Individual Evaluation) 2.1 Individual report of leadership practice Weighting: 30%	Minimal understanding of principles for leading and developing people with no references to sources of written and visual information.	Limited understanding of principles for leading and developing people with limited references to sources of written and visual information only, but no CMI resources provided.	Basic understanding of principles for leading and developing people with references to sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate but lacking relevant examples.	Good evaluation of principles for leading and developing people with references to sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate, with good examples.	Very good evaluation of principles for leading and developing people with references to sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate, with very good examples.	Excellent evaluation of principles for leading and developing people with references to a variety of sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate, with excellent insightful examples.	Exceptional evaluation of principles for leading and developing people with references to a variety of sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate, with exceptional insightful examples.
(As an Individual) 2.2 Report of entrepreneurial practice Weighting: 30%	Minimal understanding of entrepreneurial practice and entrepreneurial leadership with no references to sources of written and visual information.	Limited understanding of understanding of entrepreneurial practice and entrepreneurial leadership with limited references to sources of written information only, but no CMI resources provided.	Basic understanding of entrepreneurial practice with in-text citations and references to sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate, but lacking examples	Good evaluation of entrepreneurial practice with in-text citations and references to sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate, with good examples related to the group project.	Very good evaluation of entrepreneurial practice with in-text citations and references to sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate, with very good examples related to the group project.	Excellent evaluation of entrepreneurial practice with in-text citations and references to a variety of sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate, with excellent insightful examples related to the group project, along with strengths and weaknesses.	Exceptional evaluation of entrepreneurial practice with in-text citations and references to a variety of sources of written and visual information, including CMI resources as appropriate, with exceptional insightful examples related to the group project, along with strengths, weaknesses and recommended improvements.
(As an Individual) 3. Peer assessment and personal reflection Weighting: 10%	Little or no feedback on team member's contribution to project. Little or no reflection on own contribution and development needs for future leadership	Limited feedback on team member's contribution to project. Limited reflection on own contribution and development needs for future leadership	Basic feedback on team member's contribution to project. Minimal reflection on own contribution and some development needs for future leadership	Good level of feedback on team member's contribution to project. Reflection on own contribution and comprehensive range of development needs for future leadership	Very good level of feedback on team member's contribution to project. Reflection on own contribution and insightful and comprehensive range of development needs for future leadership	Excellent level of feedback on team member's contribution to project. Excellent level of reflection on own contribution, insightful and comprehensive range of development needs for future leadership	Exceptional level of feedback on team member's contribution to project. Exceptional level reflection on own contribution and accurate highly insightful identification of development needs with justification, for future leadership