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):	*50%*
Coursework Title:	*Demonstration Assessment*
Average Study Time Required by Student:	*100 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: Thursday 25th April 2019 16:00   Demonstrations will take place in the week commencing 29th April and 6th May. Your group will agree the time with your supervisor. It is normally in your supervision slot.
Mechanism for Submission of Work by Student: *Zip file to Blackboard and following demonstration of system.*
Date by which Work, Feedback and Marks will be returned to Students: Week commencing: week commencing 20th May 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):

Knowledge & Understanding:
1.   Plan appropriate requirements, design and implementation strategies and methods for the development of a significant computing product related to your programme of study (including consideration of commercial, economic, legal, ethical, social and professional factors)
2.   Critically apply a well-integrated requirements, design and development methodology to a computing problem

Intellectual / Professional skills & abilities:
3.   Develop a significant computing product using industrial standard development tools and techniques (including those related to information security) including the application of the required project management and team working skills
4.   Apply appropriate quality assurance techniques and work to appropriate professional standards for documentation, quality control and product integrity
Learning outcomes are assessed throughout this assessment.

Nature of the submission required:
Demonstration of product

Instructions to students:
This is a group/individual assignment

Referencing Style:
If you do make use of code or content that you have not yourself created please clear differentiate it from work that you have completed. You may make use of third party software in the completion of this module but you will only receive credit for the aspects of the product you create.

Expected size of the submission:
The submission is a zip file containing the application, and the full Terms of Reference.

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.

Note: Please be careful with the security of any accounts you may use in the completion of this assignment. In particular, you must *not* divulge your username or

password to your newnumyspace account to anybody – doing so is a breach of university regulations and can lead to disciplinary procedures.

Further information

It is expected that most, if not all demonstrations will be held during class time but, if necessary, an alternative time/s will be arranged.

You will submit a zip file to Blackboard containing:
a. All the files of the system your group constructed
b. Sufficient installation instructions to enable the re-installation of your product
c. A readme document containing relevant system details. For example the newnumyspace URL of the system and any passwords/usernames needed to use the system. The password to the newnumyspace account is NOT required.
d. Your Terms of Reference

If any group, or group member, is late for your demonstration this will be seen as being extremely unprofessional and may be taken as failure to submit this assignment. This is likely to prevent you from successfully completing the module. If you, or your group, cannot attend the agreed time/date you please notify the module tutor and your programme leader at the earliest opportunity.

This assessment is worth 100 marks in total and constitutes 50% of the module assessment.

Ensure appropriate Ethical Approval is in place. Your group must seek 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.

This assignment is intended to be a teamwork task, during which you should work as an autonomous group taking responsibility for your own individual work and the work of the group as a whole.

The University regulations on plagiarism apply to all work. For any work that is to be marked on an individual basis, the University regulations on collusion also apply.

An application should be produced to meet the specification produced in your terms of reference and requirements specification which you already completed

Each group member should demonstrate their area of responsibility and be actively involved in the presentation. The demonstration should make clear how all the essential required functionality and as many desirable and cosmetic requirements as possible (as specified in the requirements specification) have been implemented.

There is no predefined structure to the presentation; however, you must ensure that all functionality you have created individually, and as a group, is shown to the assessors.

Your demonstration will be recorded by Panopto or similar. This is to provide evidence of your demonstration to the internal moderator and the external examiner. We will provide you and your group a copy by Blackboard.

Assessment Criteria/Mark Scheme:

1   Implementation of individual specified functions (30 individual marks)

Comprehensiveness of implementation of the prototyped **functions** specified in the requirements specification derived in previous phase, including any enhancements based on feedback received for your terms of reference.

Range	Description of Quality
27-30	An exceptional prototype. Expectations have been exceeded. All the Must, Should, Could and Would-like requirements have been implemented with a high degree of fluency. Difficult to fault.
24-26	An outstanding prototype. All the Must, Should, Could and Would-like requirements have been implemented with a high degree of fluency. There are omissions, errors or oversights but these are very minor.
21-23	An excellent prototype. All the Must, Should, Could and Would-like requirements have been implemented with a high degree of fluency. There are omissions, errors or oversights but these are minor.
18-20	This is a good to very good prototype. There are issues either with the completeness of the implementation or its fluency. For example, implementation of only Must and Should have been implemented for the group member's area of responsibility, including any enhancements based on feedback received for the terms of reference, requirements and design documentation. Alternatively, maybe the implementation is slightly simple and not very fluent.
15-17	All Must requirements have been implemented for the group member's area of responsibility, as well as some of desirable or cosmetic requirements, including any enhancements based on feedback received for the terms of reference, requirements and design documentation. This has been achieved with a reasonable degree of fluency. Overall satisfactory.
12-14	This is a just about satisfactory implementation. There are likely to be issues of completeness of fluency or both. It may be an only a basic solution has been provided. It may be a number of the requirements have not been addressed. Or a combination of these. However these is still a working system which demonstrates a solution to more than 1 of the requirements. Overall weak but satisfactory.
9-11	Some essential requirements from the group member's area of responsibility are missing or have not been correctly implemented. A clear attempt has been made.
1-8	Overall, a very unsatisfactory system. A very limited attempt to address the question.
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood.

2.   Quality and Robustness of Prototype (30 individual marks)

Error handling, user validation and robustness of prototype functions; this should be demonstrated across the scope of the individual component. To obtain full marks you must have provided a fluent implementation of the full scope of your element.

Range	Description of Quality
27-30	The system ran without error. All user input is validated, and all exceptional cases are trapped. All reasonable exceptional user actions are dealt with appropriately. The full scope of the individual component is implemented with a high degree of fluency. All non-functional requirements (including security and HCI (if relevant)) have been considered and dealt with appropriately. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault.
24-26	The system ran without error. All user input is validated, and all exceptional cases are trapped. All reasonable exceptional user actions are dealt with appropriately. The full scope of the individual component is implemented with a high degree of fluency. Non-functional requirements (including security and HCI (if relevant)) have

	been considered and dealt with appropriately. There are very minor omissions, errors or oversights. Overall outstanding.
21-23	The system ran without error. All user input is validated, and all exceptional cases are trapped. All reasonable exceptional user actions are dealt with appropriately. The full scope of the individual component is implemented with a high degree of fluency. Non-functional requirements (including security and HCI (if relevant)) have been considered and dealt with appropriately. There are minor omissions, errors or oversights. Overall excellent.
18-20	The system displayed few errors in response to exceptional cases or user input, but all significant functions can be completed. Errors are minor. The majority of the individual component may be implemented competently. Good consideration of non-functional requirements (including security and HCI (if relevant)). Overall good to very good.
15-17	The system displayed errors in response to exceptional cases or user input, but all significant functions can be completed. The core elements of the individual component may be implemented competently (including any non-functional requirements); there may be issues with less high priority elements. Overall satisfactory.
12-14	The system displayed errors in response to exceptional or normal cases that prevented some significant functions from being completed. A significant attempt has been made at implementing the core elements of this component (including any non-functional requirements). Overall weak but satisfactory
9-11	The system showed errors, either in normal or exceptional cases, which prevented any significant functions or non-functional requirements from being completed. Overall unsatisfactory.
1-8	Overall, very unsatisfactory. A very limited attempt to address the question. Something is demonstrable.
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood.

3. Demonstration structure, understanding & responses to questions (20 individual marks)

Structure and clarity of demonstration; understanding of the work done; quality of responses to questions about the prototype. We expect you to demonstrate professionalism by being punctual, using appropriate language and respect for your audience and team members and measured responses to questions.

Marks	Description of quality
18-20	Clear and concise responses and explanations provided: a thorough demonstration of the individual area of responsibility. Highly professional throughout. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault.
16-17	Clear and concise responses and explanations provided: a thorough demonstration of the individual area of responsibility. Highly professional throughout. Any criticism / suggestions for improvement are very minor. Overall outstanding.
14-15	Clear and concise responses and explanations provided: a thorough demonstration of the individual area of responsibility. Highly professional throughout. Any criticism / suggestions for improvement are minor. Overall excellent.
12-13	Good to very good responses and explanations provided most of the time, though at times showed a minor lack of knowledge and/or insight about the individual area of responsibility. Professional throughout
10-11	Satisfactory to good responses and explanations provided the majority of the time, though at times showed lack of knowledge and insight about the individual area of responsibility. Professional throughout.

8-9	Weak but satisfactory responses and explanations provided some of the time, though showed lack of knowledge and insight about the individual area of responsibility. Minor lapses in professionalism
6-7	Poor responses and demonstration of the prototype, showing little confidence, insight and/or knowledge about the individual area of responsibility. Could be lacking in professionalism in a minor manner.
1-5	Very poor responses and demonstration of the prototype, showing little confidence, insight and/or knowledge about the individual area of responsibility. Could be lacking in professionalism in a minor manner
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood. Or could be major lapses in professionalism (turning up very late (in the middle of the demo maybe), swearing, talking very loudly whilst the group is presenting, rudeness, etc)

4.   Quality and Consistency of System Integration (20 group marks)

Comprehensiveness of system integration and consistency of the whole system. You will not be penalised for incomplete individual sub-components. Additionally if there are group issues please inform the module team at the earliest opportunity.

Range	Description of Quality
18-20	The system has been integrated to a high standard and any user interface follows a consistent standard throughout. Common functionality is implemented to an extremely high standard. Overall exceptional. Difficult to fault.
16-17	The system has been integrated to a high standard and any user interface follows a consistent standard throughout. Common functionality is implemented to an extremely high standard. Any divergence from this standard is very minor and does not interfere with the overall usability of the system. Overall outstanding.
14-20	The system has been integrated to a high standard and any user interface follows a consistent standard throughout. Common functionality is implemented to an extremely high standard. Any divergence from this standard is minor and does not interfere with the overall usability of the system. Overall excellent.
12-13	The system has been well integrated and is largely consistent. Common functionality is clear easy to use and is generally to a very high standard. Overall good to very good.
10-11	The system has been fairly well integrated. Common functionality has been implemented to a satisfactory standard but could lead to some confusion for novice users. Overall satisfactory.
8-9	Some evidence of an integrated system and a consistent and appropriate interface standard, though with several omissions and inconsistencies.
6-7	Limited evidence of integration. For example, very little evidence of a consistent interface standard or many of the sub-systems have to be demonstrated separately. Something is demonstrable e.g. at least two subcomponents have been integrated. Overall unsatisfactory.
1-5	Overall, very poor. There is very limited evidence of an attempt to integrate the system. Something is demonstrable e.g. at least two aspects have been integrated in some manner
0	Not meaningfully addressed. A minimal attempt or the task has been seriously misunderstood.