|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **ASSIGNMENT COVER PAGE** | | | C:\Users\hoching.tay\Desktop\Lincoln_UK_06092017-01.png |
| **Programme** | | | **Course Code and Title** | | |
| UCSEW | | | CSE3033/N SOFTWARE ENGINEERING | | |
| **Student’s name / student’s id** | | | **Lecturer’s name** | | |
|  | | | TEE ENG HONG | | |
| **Date issued** | **Submission Deadline** | | | **Indicative Weighting** | |
| 22/1/2024 | 19/2/2024 | | | 30% | |
| **Assignment [1] title** | Agile Project Case Study and Analysis | | | | |
| 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: | | | | | |
| Submission Date: | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dates and Mechanisms for Assessment Submission and Feedback** | |
| **Mechanism for handout to students** | OpenLearning LMS/ MS Teams |
| **Mechanism for submission of work by student** | *Softcopy online submission via OpenLearning/MS Teams* |
| **Date by which work, feedback and marks will be returned to students** | 4/3/2024 |
| **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 OpenLearning/MS Teams. 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.

**We practice zero tolerance towards plagiarism, and we use Turnitin to evaluate the similarity index. Your similarity index score must not exceed 20%.**

**Your tasks must be your own work. Unless the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is permitted in your assessment task, using AI to complete your assignment is a form of plagiarism.**

# 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](#_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.

Please take note for group submission, only **one submission per group**. This will contain both the group and individual elements. The individual element must be clearly labelled to indicate which group member completed the task.

# 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 UOWM KDU Penang University College and University of Lincoln (UoL) logos on top. Also include page number at the footer page 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)

# File naming convention

Please make sure you save your filename with the following format:

* <Student Name>\_coursecode\_A1\_Jan24.pdf

# Assignment instructions/Background

**Description**

This assignment is an **individual assignment.**

**Grading Assessment:** Please refer to the marking rubric for the assessment.

**Task**

1) Software Development Methodology

Your company is getting a new software development project from an educational institution. The customer will be using the software to perform student’s registration, tracking students study progress, result management, payment management. The customer knows very well what the software features they need, as this new project should be an upgrade to their existing system. You need to choose 1 **(one)** software development methodologies to develop the new software. Justify your choice and then describe the activities involved in the design and development process of the software. You must also describe the strengths and weaknesses of the development process.

2) Design Review

Review the scope and user interface design for 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 Sustainability & Improvement

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

**Handing in your work**

This is an individual assignment. Each student should upload the document in PDF in CSE3033N Jan24 Microsoft Teams, Assignment 1 section.

**Deadline**

The deadline for report submission of this assignment is on **date 19/2/2024 (Week 05)**

**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 (35%) [CLO3] | No discussion or totally wrong description of software development methodologies for the software. | Part of software development methodology description is incorrect or software development methodology are described with very brief justification. | The software development methodology is described with a few areas of justifications are unclear or incorrect. | The description of the software development methodology for the software are correct with 1-2 areas of justifications are unclear or incorrect. | The description of the software development methodology for the software are correct and the justifications are detailed and clear. | Raw mark  /100  Section mark  /35 |
| Section 2: Design Review (35%) [CLO3] | No review of the scope and design aspects of the software or all review areas are incorrect. | The review of the scope and design aspects of the software are largely irrelevant with very limited evidence and explanations. | The review of the scope and design aspects of the 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 software are given with 1-2 areas of explanations are unclear or incorrect. | The review of the scope and design aspects of the software are given and the explanations are detailed and clear with full evidence. | Raw mark  /100  Section mark  /35 |
| Section 3: Software Sustainability & Improvement (30%) [CLO2] | No discussion on software sustainability & improvement or all discussion are incorrect. | Only part of software’s sustainability & improvement is discussed, or software’s sustainability & improvement are discussed but irrelevant with very limited evidence and explanations. | The software’s sustainability & improvement area of the software are discussed but a few areas are unclear or incorrect, wrongly justified. | The software’s sustainability & improvement area of the software are discussed with 1-2 areas are unclear or incorrect, wrongly justified. | The software’s sustainability & improvement area of the software are discussed and the explanations are detailed and clear with full evidence. | Raw mark  /100  Section mark  /30 |
| **Total Score:** | | | | | | **/100** |