COURSEWORK ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

Module Title:	*Team Project and Professionalism*
Module Number:	*KV6002*
Module Tutor Name(s):	*Tom Prickett*
Academic Year:	*2018-2019 (Semester 2)*
% Weighting (to overall module):	*40%*
Coursework Title:	*Evaluation Report*
Average Study Time Required by Student:	*20 study hours*

Dates and Mechanisms for Assessment Submission and Feedback

Date of Handout to Students:
Week commencing: w/c 14th January 2019

Mechanism for Handout to Students:
via Blackboard

Date and Time of Submission by Student:
16th May 2019 by 4pm

Mechanism for Submission of Work by Student:
Via Blackboard Turnitin

Date by which Work, Feedback and Marks will be returned to Students:
Week commencing: 5th June 2019

Mechanism for return of assignment work, feedback and marks to students:
Feedback will be returned via email / Blackboard.

Contents

Learning Outcomes tested in this assessment (from the Module Descriptor):

Personal Values Attributes (Global / Cultural awareness, Ethics, Curiosity) (PVA):

5.   Critically evaluate project work in terms of the technical decision making, group work, processes and responsibilities, the final project deliverables as well as the professionalism, ethical and legal considerations and potential social impacts (including information security).

Nature of the submission required:
Written report

Instructions to students:
This is an individual assignment

Please ensure appropriate Ethical Approval is in place. Your group must have sought Ethical Approval for your project. If you do not obtain such approval, we are sorry but we will not be able to mark your work and as such you will receive a mark of 0.

Referencing Style:
Harvard (author/date) referencing is required.

Expected size of the submission:

The overall word limit for the report is 2000 words (excluding title page, table of contents, reference list and appendices if used). In accordance with the University's Word Limit Policy the following penalties will be applied:

Under the word limit   No Penalty: In not making use of the full word count, students may have self-penalised their work. If students have been able to achieve the requirements of the assessment component using fewer words than allocated, they will not be penalised.
Up to 10% over word limit No Penalty: Situation flagged by tutor in feedback but over-run is tolerated and no deduction is made from the final mark for the affected component.
More than 10% over the word limit   Deduction of marks: 10% of the total marks available for the affected component shall be deducted from the assessment mark.
For clarity: a piece of work which would have scored 65% for that component but that has a word count greater than 10% of the prescribed word limit will be allocated 55%; a piece of work which would have scored 45% for that component but that has a word count greater than 10% of the prescribed word limit will be allocated 35%.

Academic Conduct:
You must adhere to the university regulations on academic conduct. Formal inquiry proceedings will be instigated if there is any suspicion of misconduct or plagiarism in your work. Refer to the University's regulations on assessment if you are unclear as to the meaning of these terms. The latest copy is available on the university website.

This is an individual assignment.   It should be your own unaided work and you should take care to avoid all forms of academic misconduct, including collusion and plagiarism. You are reminded that the University regulations for copying, collusion and plagiarism will apply

Tasks

A critical evaluation document should be produced which details the entire system, the group effort and your individual input to the application, the ways in which your work dealt with the issues of professional practice and quality, and how decisions made elsewhere impacted on your own decisions. This will depend on the nature of the responsibilities you undertook. You must produce a report that provides a critical evaluation on the system implemented and the tools/techniques used to facilitate the implementation.

Each group member must also submit relevant copies of the minutes of the formal meetings held as an appendix to the main document. These will enable you to comment on the group work process, the decisions that were made and your particular role in the project – please refer to your Terms of Reference and meeting minutes.

This critical evaluation document is worth 40% of the entire module mark. There is no word count but you are expected to be **concise** whilst ensuring you cover all of the criteria below. Guidance is provided regarding expectations/marking scheme.

Examples should be used throughout to support each section. Evidence should be provided to support your claims and statements - use appendices appropriately to support your work. Reference should be made to meeting minutes submitted in the document's appendix to show when key decisions were made, when issues were discussed and when/how tasks were assigned.

NOTE this document is not:
   a. A description of what happened
   b. A blame finding exercise / witch hunt
   c. We are great us – didn't we do well!
   d. A collection of unjustified views

Assessment Criteria/Mark Scheme:

Critically evaluate the project with reference to supporting evidence from the project and wider literature:

1. The system produced and how functional and non-functional requirements were addressed (including information security).

Additionally, you must consider other pertinent aspects including:
Fitness for purpose (e.g. how well does your system, and its various elements, meet its purpose?)
Robustness (how reliable is the system in use?)
Look and feel (how easy is it to accomplish tasks? Does it look accommodating?)
Consistency (Is the interface to all parts similar in appearance?)
Technical evaluation (appropriateness of technology used, code quality, etc)
How non-functional requirements were addressed (including cyber security).

Marks	Description of quality
27-30	Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive review of system. Strong supporting evidence. Non-functional requirements including cyber security considered well. Exceptional overall. Difficult to fault.
24-26	Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive review of system. Strong supporting evidence. Non-functional requirements including cyber security considered well. Any criticisms / areas for improvement are very minor. Outstanding overall.
21-23	Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive review of system. Strong supporting evidence. Non-functional requirements including cyber security considered well. Any criticisms / areas for improvement are minor. Excellent overall.
18-20	Well written, all elements considered and largely critical in tone but lacking insight. Substantial review of system. Claims evidenced well. Strong consideration of non-functional requirements including cyber security. A good to very good evaluation.
15-17	Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is not well written or presented. Review of system lacks both consideration and evidence. Some consideration of non-functional requirements including cyber security. A satisfactory evaluation.
12-14	Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak review of system missing some elements with poor evidence. Little consideration of non-functional requirements (however they are considered). A weak but satisfactory evaluation.
9-11	Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed, weak or absent evidence. Lacking in evaluation. Overall unsatisfactory.
1-8	A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor.
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood.

2. Project Management, Process and Personal Achievement.

You might wish to discuss:
Your Terms of Reference (the aspects that worked well and those that worked less successfully)
Your requirements and design documentation (those that were useful or less so)
Your time management and that of your group
Configuration management (how your group managed the source code)
Integration strategies (how you managed the incorporation of all elements)
Testing strategies (were these effective? comprehensive?)

The leadership of your group (its effectiveness, technique etc)
Quality planning and control and monitoring within your project (how you ensured a quality product, on time etc)
Is there anything you would have liked to do in your application that you didn't have time/resources to make possible?
Were there any problems? How have you solved them? What lessons have you learnt?

Marks	Description of quality
27-30	Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on tools and techniques used. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault.
24-26	Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on tools and techniques used. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor.
21-23	Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on tools and techniques used. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Excellent overall. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor.
18-20	Well written, all elements considered and largely critical in tone but lacking insight. Substantial review of techniques/tools used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. Overall good to very good.
15-17	Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of tools techniques used is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. Overall satisfactory.
12-14	Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding tools and techniques. Overall poor but satisfactory.
9-11	Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. Not satisfactory
1-8	A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor.
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood

3. Professional Issues.

You might wish to discuss:
Your professionalism and that of your group, for example, with regard to: commitment, effort, responsibility, collaboration, adherence to standards/codes etc.
How you have mitigated any professional issues that were or were not considered in your ToR.
What further professional issues might arise in the future if the product was installed / made commercial available /etc

Marks	Description of quality
9-10	Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault.
8	Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor.

7	Excellent discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall excellent. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor.
6	Well written and largely critical discussion of the issues involved but lacking insight. Substantial review issues used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. Overall good to very good. There are areas of improvement that prevent the answer from being excellent.
5	Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of issue involved is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. Overall satisfactory.
4	Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding the issues. Overall poor but satisfactory (just)
3	Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. Not satisfactory
1-2	A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor.
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood

4. Legal Issues.

You might wish to discuss:
How you have mitigated any legal issues that were or were not considered in your ToR.
What further legal issues might arise in the future if the product was installed / made commercial available /etc

Marks	Description of quality
9-10	Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault.
8	Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor.
7	Excellent discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall excellent. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor.
6	Well written and largely critical discussion of the issues involved but lacking insight. Substantial review issues used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. Overall good to very good. There are areas of improvement that prevent the answer from being excellent.
5	Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of issue involved is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. Overall satisfactory.
4	Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding the issues. Overall poor but satisfactory (just)
3	Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. Not satisfactory

1-2	A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor.
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood

5. Social Issues.

You might wish to discuss:
How you have mitigated any social issues that were or were not considered in your ToR.
What further social issues might arise in the future if the product was installed / made commercial available /etc

Marks	Description of quality
9-10	Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault.
8	Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor.
7	Excellent discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall excellent. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor.
6	Well written and largely critical discussion of the issues involved but lacking insight. Substantial review issues used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. Overall good to very good. There are areas of improvement that prevent the answer from being excellent.
5	Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of issue involved is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. Overall satisfactory.
4	Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding the issues. Overall poor but satisfactory (just)
3	Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. Not satisfactory
1-2	A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor.
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood

6. Ethical Issues.

You might wish to discuss:
How you have mitigated any ethical issues that were or were not considered in your ToR.
What further ethical issues might arise in the future if the product was installed / made commercial available /etc

Marks	Description of quality
9-10	Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues

	involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault.
8	Exceptional discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall outstanding. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are very minor.
7	Excellent discussion of relevant issues. Very well written - critically evaluates to a high standard and shows insight. Comprehensive reflection on the issues involved. Claims well supported by evidence from the project and the wider literature. Overall excellent. Any criticisms or areas for improvement are minor.
6	Well written and largely critical discussion of the issues involved but lacking insight. Substantial review issues used. Evidenced appropriately from the project and wider literature. There may be issues with the quality of some the supplied supporting evidence. Overall good to very good. There are areas of improvement that prevent the answer from being excellent.
5	Slightly lacking critical evaluation and/or is has limitation in how it is written or presented. Reflection of issue involved is lacking in consideration and tendency to be descriptive. May not make as much use of evidence. Overall satisfactory.
4	Poorly written - lacking critical evaluation but not entirely descriptive. Weak reflection regarding the issues. Overall poor but satisfactory (just)
3	Poorly written, descriptive, many elements missed. Little reflection, weak evidence provided. Not satisfactory
1-2	A very limited attempt, lacking thought and/or relevant research and or evidence. May be very descriptive. Will be very lacking in evaluation. Very poor.
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood