Course: COMP1640 Enterprise Web Software Development	**Contribution: 100% of course**
73: Enterprise Web Software Development - Term 2 - MAC	**PDF file required**
Greenwich Course Leader: Dr Ray Stoneham	**Due date: 13th April 2017**
This coursework should take an average student who is up-to-date with tutorial work approximately 50 hours	
Learning Outcomes: All	

Plagiarism is presenting somebody else's work as your own. It includes: copying information directly from the Web or books without referencing the material; submitting joint coursework as an individual effort; copying another student's coursework; stealing or buying coursework from someone else and submitting it as your own work. Suspected plagiarism will be investigated and if found to have occurred will be dealt with according to the procedures set down by the University.

All material copied or amended from any source (e.g. internet, books) must be referenced correctly according to the reference style you are using.

Your work will be submitted for electronic plagiarism checking. Any attempt to bypass our plagiarism detection systems will be treated as a severe Assessment Offence.

Coursework Submission Requirements

- An electronic copy of your work for this coursework should be fully uploaded by midnight (local time) on the Deadline Date.
- The last version you upload will be the one that is marked.
- For this coursework you must submit a single Acrobat PDF document. In general, any text in the document must not be an image (i.e. must not be scanned) and would normally be generated from other documents (e.g. MS Office using "Save As .. PDF").
- There are limits on the file size. The current limits are displayed on the coursework submission page on the Intranet
- Make sure that any files you upload are virus-free and not protected by a password or corrupted otherwise they will be treated as null submissions.
- Comments on your work will be available from the Coursework page on the Intranet. The grade will be made available in the portal.
- You must NOT submit a paper copy of this coursework.
- All coursework must be submitted as above

The University website has details of the current Coursework Regulations, including details of penalties for late submission, procedures for Extenuating Circumstances, and penalties for Assessment Offences. See http://www2.gre.ac.uk/current-students/regs for details.

COMP1640 Collaborations Coursework Specification (Term 2, 2016/17)

Scenario

This is a group coursework. You will be assigned to a group.

You need to adopt agile scrum working practices, and document your meetings appropriately. Ideally you need a database designer, an information architect, a programmer, a web designer and a tester, as well as a scrum master and product owner, but more than one person can be in any technical role. No one is to take the role of project manager, but there could be a technical team leader.

You will get an individual grade (40%) based on your report. There is also a group grade (60%), weighted by your contribution to the team effort (from 0% to 100%).

Specification

You are required to build a web-based secure role-based system for collecting and processing Extenuating Circumstances (EC) claims by students in a large university.

The system must meet the following criteria:

- The University has a EC Manager to oversee the process.
- All Faculties have a EC Coordinator who is responsible for managing the process for their Faculty.
- All students can submit one or more EC claims for any item of assessment.
- All students must also upload images or PDFs to provide supporting evidence. Claims can not be processed without uploaded evidence.
- All new claims are disabled after a closure date for new claims, but uploads of evidence can continue to be done until a final closure date.
- Once a claim is submitted the system emails a notification to the Faculty's EC Coordinator, who must process it within 14 days.
- Once a claim is processed the student receives an email containing the decision.
- An EC Coordinator can only access claims by students in their Faculty.
- Each EC Coordinator needs to be able to process the claims by students in their Faculty in order to approve or reject them.
- The University EC Manager can view all the claims but cannot process any
- An administrator maintains any system data, e.g. closure dates for each academic year; items of assessment and their due dates; students and passwords
- Students need to be able to view their own claims and any decisions.
- Statistical analysis (e.g. number of claims per Faculty) needs to be available.
- The interface must be suitable for all devices (eg mobile phones, tablets, desktops).

Assumptions

You must clearly state any assumptions you make.

Reports

A number of reports need to be made available. For example

- Statistics
    - Number of claims within each Faculty for each academic year.
    - Percentage of claims by each Faculty for any academic year.
    - Number of students making a claim within each Faculty for each academic year.
- Exception reports
    - Claims without uploaded evidence.
    - Claims without a decision after 14 days.

Tasks

1. Work as a team using agile scrum methods to develop and test a secure web-based system to meet the above specification.
2. Create a brief screencast recording (including screen and sound) demonstrating the key functionalities of the system. This can be created using any suitable software (eg Camtasia or Jing) and hosted securely on the cloud.
3. Present the finished product to a non-technical audience to try to persuade them to purchase your system.
4. Document the system to an appropriate standard, including an evaluation of the design process you followed and your reflection on the finished product, and on the contributions of your team members.

Deliverables

1. A **Group Repository** containing all the artefacts produced by the team (eg ERD, minutes, test log, product backlog) with a menu allowing easy access to its content. The repository must be secure, but accessible by the Greenwich moderator.
2. An **Individual PDF Report**
   The report must give the **URL** of the Group Repository, the Screencast and the website and any **usernames or passwords** needed to access it. The **individual component of the marking will be based on your report,** so ensure this has evidence that your system meets the specified requirements. **The text in your individual report must be entirely your own words.**
3. A **Presentation** and **Screencast**
   You must be present as part of the team that presents the finished product to your tutor, and should contribute to the screencast. The **presentation** should be pitched at a non-technical audience to try to persuade them to purchase the product; the **screencast** should demonstrate the functionality of the system

Assessment Breakdown

Group Component (60%)

To be created by the group on a secure shared area accessible to the Greenwich moderator. Password and URL must be provided in individual reports and verified by the marker. Must be suitably structured with a menu. Suggested location: GitHUB, own website, DropBox or other repository.

Database 10%

Expect: Security, appropriate data types and validation, clear ERD, referential integrity implemented, enables roles to be implemented

Site design 10%

Expect: Responsive design, clear information architecture for both mobile and desktop, aesthetically pleasing, good usability, meets accessibility criteria

Functionality 10%

Expect: Role based security, submission of reports, email notification, summary and exception reports, UML diagrams, code snippets

Testing 10%

Expect: Test plan, test log, sufficient data to fully test, evidence of testing finding errors, test items linked to user stories in the product backlog

Agile methods followed 10%

Expect: Burn down chart, minutes of meetings, user stories, sprints, product backlogs

Screencast and Presentation 10%

Expect: Professional standard of presentation promoting the product, with contributions by all the team members, Screencast demonstrating all the main features of the product. Screencast can be done by one person.

Weighting factor for each student (scale 0 to 10)

Commitment	Weight
Fully committed	10
Committed	8
Contributed substantially	6
Contributed partially	4
Minimal contribution	2
No contribution	0

Individual Component (40%)

N.B.: No shared content in the report, i.e. must be entirely in your own words, Must include title page with a list of team members and roles, URL and password of group repository, site and screencast.

Evaluation of product and process 10%
Expect: Appropriate screen shots and commentary, with cross references to group documents, evaluative comments on the product and on the agile process used to build it

Evaluation of team 10%
Expect: A weighted scoring model of the entire team (including yourself) with own choice of criteria and weighting, supported by commentary on each individual member. Model is expected to produce a range of scores for the individual members.

Self-evaluation 10%
Expect: Honest description of own contribution, and reflection on own performance and any lessons learnt

Quality of documentation 10%
Expect: NO SHARED CONTENT, professional standard, header page, page numbers, table of contents, headings, cropped images, figure captions, no spelling or grammatical errors.

Indicative Grading Criteria

>=70%	Well designed system to fully meet the requirements Professional standard of report, with appropriate documentation High level of individual commitment High level of evaluative commentary
60-69%	Well designed system to meet most of the requirements Professional standard of report High level of individual commitment Limited evaluative commentary
50-59%	Well designed system to meet most of the requirements Acceptable standard of report Good level of individual commitment Limited evaluative commentary
40-49%	Acceptable system to meet most of the requirements Acceptable standard of report Acceptable level of individual commitment Limited evaluative commentary
<40%	Poorly designed system Few requirements met Poor standard of report Limited individual commitment No evaluative commentary