

Coursework 2 Specification – team development project

Read this assessment brief carefully, it tells you how you are going to be assessed, how to submit your assessment on-time and how (and when) you'll receive your marks and feedback.

Module Code	CSI_6_ICT & LAW_6_LTE
Module Title	ICT Project Management in Practice & Law & Technology
Lecturer	Lucia Otoyoy & Andy Unger
% of Module Mark	70%
Distributed	18/10/2023 (week 3)
Submission Method	Submit online via this Module's Moodle site
Submission Deadline	15/12/23 at 5pm *
Release of Feedback & Marks	Feedback and provisional marks will be available in the Gradebook on Moodle from 19/01/24

* Please submit well in advance in case you run into technical issues.

Coursework Aim:

This coursework is designed to provide you with experience in Legal Design and Project management, specifically using the Scrum agile software development framework. You will work in multidisciplinary teams and with a client. Over a period of 8 weeks, you will be required to elicit and analyse user requirements, create designs of the system, justify your selection of tools and then incrementally build a working prototype of the system in close collaboration with your client following agile practices.

Coursework Details:

Type:	Project team report (100%)
Word Count:	<p>As a guide, aim for 3,500-4,000 words. The maximum word limit is 4,000 words. The title page, table of contents, references, bibliography and appendix, will not count towards the word total.</p> <p>If the total word limit is exceeded, your mark may be reduced as part of the report quality marking criteria.</p>

<p>Report Structure and Quality Guidelines:</p>	<p>1. Project Overview Describe the project problem, aim and objectives, together with the user roles and their high-level requirements.</p> <p>2. Technical review Select project specific evaluation criteria and compare and critically evaluate potential technologies and tools. Then select and justify tools and technologies chosen for your project, supported with relevant, credible and consistent citations.</p> <p>3. Team structure, roles and responsibilities Define team structure, roles and responsibilities in detail. These should be fairly distributed considering team strengths and theories from literature. (The scrum master role will be undertaken by your tutor.)</p> <p>4. Design Present creative and practical designs of the system, which address the client problem and user needs. Designs should be thoroughly tested through reviews and feedback iterations.</p> <p>5. Development The developed system needs to have key features working and tested, which should be evident through a video demonstration. System should address, even exceed client expectations, which is evidenced through client feedback. Git versioning system is used effectively.</p> <p>6. Product and Sprint backlogs User stories in the product and sprint backlogs should follow recognized format and should capture all the stakeholder requirements comprehensively. A record of sprint backlogs should demonstrate good sprint planning.</p> <p>7. Retrospective meetings Provide a comprehensive record of all 4 sprint retrospective meetings, which demonstrate continuous and exceptional process and teamwork improvement.</p> <p>8. References Use Harvard Referencing. See the LSBU Library pages for help.</p> <p>Quality Guidelines for Report</p> <p>Report quality considers the clarity of our writing, the overall structure of the report, attention to spelling and grammar, adherence to the specified wordcount, and the proper implementation of referencing styles for both in text citations and the reference list.</p> <p>Quality Guidelines for Demonstration Your video demonstration must include contributions from every</p>
--	---

	<p>team member, effectively showcasing the essential design elements and working functionalities of your project.</p> <p>The video demonstration must be uploaded onto YouTube and a link to it included within your report. Please ensure that the video does not exceed 8 minutes in length; however, it can be shorter without incurring a penalty. Any content exceeding the 8-minute limit will not be considered during evaluation and will also affect the quality of your demonstration.</p>
How are marks awarded:	<p>The team mark will be awarded to each member of the team. However, based on a process of peer evaluation (see Resources section at the end of this specification), individual marks may be adjusted to reflect individual contributions (poor or outstanding) to the team project.</p>
Presentation:	<p>Work must be referenced, and a bibliography provided.</p> <p>Work must be submitted as a Word document (.docx).</p> <p>Coursework must be submitted using Arial font size 11 (or larger if you need to), with 1.5 line spacing.</p> <p>Student name and number for each team member must be shown at the front of the coursework.</p>
Regulations:	<p>Make sure you understand the University Regulations on expected academic practice and academic misconduct. Note in particular: Your work must be your own. Markers will be attentive to both the plausibility of the sources provided as well as the consistency and approach to writing of the work. Simply, if you do the research and reading, and then write it up on your own, giving the reference to sources, you will approach the work in the appropriate way and will cause not give markers reason to question the authenticity of the work.</p> <p>All quotations must be credited and properly referenced. Paraphrasing is still regarded as plagiarism if you fail to acknowledge the source for the ideas being expressed.</p> <p>TURNITIN: When you upload your work to the Moodle site it will be checked by anti-plagiarism software.</p>

Learning Outcomes

This assessment (CW2 in the table below) will fully or partially assess the following learning outcomes for this module.

Learning outcome	Assessed by	
	CW1	CW2
A. Knowledge and Understanding		
• Research technologies, techniques and project management methodologies in relation to the problem identification.	Partially	Fully
• Decompose the problem into concrete steps amenable to analysis and solution.	Partially	Fully
B. Intellectual Skills		
• Critically evaluate technical and academic literature and write structured, evidence-informed arguments regarding project planning.	Fully	Partially
• Analyse a practical problem and propose appropriate and feasible solutions	-	Fully
C. Practical Skills		
• Manage time and resources as consultants to deliver an artefact solving a practical problem.	Partially	Fully
• Design, plan, execute and evaluate a computing/information technology solution.	-	Fully
D. Transferable Skills		
• Sustain self-directed learning and work effectively as a team member.	Partially	Fully
• Write formal/technical reports.	Partially	Fully

Assessment Criteria and Weighting

LSBU marking criteria have been developed to help tutors give you clear and helpful feedback on your work. They will be applied to your work to help you understand what you have accomplished, how any mark given was arrived at, and how you can improve your work in future.

Final report (100% of CW2)

	Weighting	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Project overview	5%	Description of the project problem, aim, objectives and user roles and their high-level requirements go beyond expectations. 5 points	Exceptionally well-defined description of the project problem, aim, objectives and user roles and their high-level requirements. 4.5 points	Excellent, well-defined description of the project problem, aim, objectives and user roles and their high-level requirements. 4 points	Very good description of the project problem, aim, objectives and user roles and their high-level requirements. 3.5 points	Good description, of the project problem, aim, objectives and user roles and their high-level requirements. 3 points	Average description, of the project problem, aim, objectives and user roles and their high-level requirements. 2.5 points	Basic description, of the project problem, aim, objectives and user roles and their high-level requirements. 2 points	Description of the project problem, aim, objectives and/or user roles and their high-level requirements are not very clear. 1.5 points	Description of the project problem, aim, objectives and/or user roles and their high-level requirements have major omissions or errors. 1 point	Very little to no description of the project problem, aim, objectives and/or user roles and their high-level requirements provided. 0.5 point	No description of the project problem, aim, objectives and/or user roles and their high-level requirements provided. 0 points
Technical review	10%	Beyond expectations review with project specific evaluation criteria used to compare and critically evaluate a range of technologies and tools. Selection and justification for the technologies and tools chosen is beyond expectations. Outstanding use of relevant, credible & consistent citations. 10 points	9Exceptional review with project specific evaluation criteria used to compare and critically evaluate a range of technologies and tools. Selection and justification for the technologies and tools chosen is beyond expectations. Outstanding use of relevant, credible & consistent citations. 9 points	Excellent review with project specific evaluation criteria used to compare and critically evaluate a range of technologies and tools. Selection and justification for the technologies and tools chosen is excellent with relevant, credible & consistent citations. 8 points	Very good review with project specific evaluation criteria used to compare and critically evaluate a range of technologies and tools. Selection and justification for the technologies and tools chosen is very good with relevant, credible & consistent citations. 7 points	Good review with project specific evaluation criteria used to compare a range of technologies and tools. Selection and justification of the technologies and tools chosen is good and uses some evidence of research and some citations. 6 points	Evaluation and justification may be too generic and/or only some evidence of research and some citations provided. 5 points	Pass: Some evaluation and justification provided although not very clear, specific or completely correct and/or little evidence of research. 4 points	Limited evaluation provided and/or with omissions. 3 points	Very limited evaluation. 2 points	Very limited evaluation with major shortcomings. 1 points	No evaluation provided. 0 points

Team structure, roles and responsibilities	5%	Beyond expectations: Team structure, roles and responsibilities are defined beyond expectations, they are detailed and well distributed, considering team strengths and supported by theories from literature. 5 points	Exceptional: Team structure, roles and responsibilities are exceptionally well defined, detailed and well distributed, considering team strengths and supported by theories from literature. 4.5 points	Excellent: Team structure, roles and responsibilities are excellently defined, detailed and well distributed, considering team strengths and supported by theories from literature. 4 points	Very good: Team structure, roles and responsibilities are very well defined, detailed and fairly distributed, considering team strengths. 3.5 points	Good: Team structure, roles and responsibilities are well defined, detailed and fairly distributed, considering most team strengths. 3 points	Average: Team structure, roles and responsibilities are defined, through there is lack of detail. Distributed mostly with fairness and considering some team strengths. 2.5 points	Pass: Team structure, roles and responsibilities are defined to some extent, through there is lack of detail. Distributed with some unfairness and/or only considering some team strengths. 2 points	Limited team structure definition. 1.5 points	Very limited team structure definition. 1 point	Very limited with major omissions or shortcomings. 0.5 point	No team structure definition. 0 points
Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses client's problem Designed to meet users' needs Effective design created 	20%	Client problem and user needs are addressed beyond client's expectations. Design is very creative, practical and thoroughly tested. 20 points	Client problem and user needs are addressed exceptionally well. Design is very creative, practical and thoroughly tested. 18 points	Excellent: Client problem and user needs are addressed excellently. Design is very creative, practical and thoroughly tested. 16 points	Very good: Client problem and user needs are very well addressed. Design is creative, practical and tested. 14 points	Good: Client problem and user needs are well addressed. Design is basic but practical and tested. 12 points	Average: Client problem and user needs are partly addressed. Design is practical and tested. 10 points	Pass: Client problem and user needs are partly addressed. Design is not very creative, practical or well tested. 8 points	Limited design demonstrated. 6 points	Very limited design demonstrated. 4 points	Very limited or almost no design demonstrated. 2 points	No design demonstrated. 0 points
Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses client's problem A working software developed 	20%	Client problem and user needs are addressed beyond client's expectations. Developed software is tested and has key features working beyond expectations which is demonstrated using a professional video demo. GIT versioning system is used effectively. 20 points	Client problem and user needs are addressed exceptionally well. Developed software is tested and has key features working exceptionally well which is demonstrated using a professional video demo. GIT versioning system is used. 20 points	Excellent: Client problem and user needs are addressed excellently. Developed software is tested and has key features working excellently well which is demonstrated using a professional video demo. GIT versioning system is used. 20 points	Very good: Client problem and user needs are very well addressed. Developed software is tested and has key features working very well which is demonstrated using a professional video demo. GIT versioning system is used very well. 14 points	Good: Client problem and user needs are well addressed. Developed software is tested and has key features working which is demonstrated using a good video demo. Git is used. 12 points	Average: Client problem and user needs are addressed. Developed software is tested and partially works. Only basic video demonstration is provided. Average use of Git. 10 points	Pass: Client problem and user needs are partly addressed. Key features of the software are only partially developed. Only basic video demonstration and limited evidence of testing provided. Git may not have been used effectively or at all. 8 points	Limited software development and testing demonstrated. 6 points	Very limited software development and testing demonstrated. 4 points	Very limited or almost no software development and testing demonstrated. 2 points	No software development demonstrated. 0 points

			effectively. 18 points	effectively. 16 points								
Product and Sprint backlogs	10%	Application of all appropriate elements of a user story captures all stakeholder requirements beyond expectations in a comprehensive set of user stories in the product backlog. Sprints are planned beyond expectation. 10 points	An exceptionally comprehensive application of all appropriate elements of a user story which captures all stakeholder requirements in a comprehensive set of user stories. Sprints are exceptionally well planned. 9 points	Excellent and comprehensive application of all appropriate elements of a user story which captures all stakeholder requirements in a comprehensive set of user stories. Sprints are exceptionally well planned. 8 points	A very good application of all appropriate elements of a user story which captures all stakeholder requirements in a broad set of user stories. Sprints are very well planned. 7 points	A good application of all basic elements of a user story but captures stakeholder requirements in a too narrow set of user stories. Sprints are well planned. 6 points	Average application of all basic elements of a user story but captures stakeholder requirements in a too narrow set of user stories. Sprints are planned. 5 points	Pass: Some attempt made but format not followed or not followed consistently. Not every stakeholder included, or some captured stories are incorrect. Basic evidence of planning present. 4 points	Limited attempt made and format not followed. 3 points	Very limited attempt made, format not followed. 2 points	Very limited attempt made with major shortcomings. Format not followed. 1 point	None evident. 0 points
Retrospective meetings	10%	Comprehensive record of all four retrospective meetings, providing evidence of continuous and exceptional process and teamwork improvement that's beyond expectations at	An exceptionally comprehensive record of all four retrospective meetings, providing evidence of continuous and exceptional process and teamwork	Excellent and comprehensive record of all four retrospective meetings, providing evidence of continuous and excellent process and teamwork improvement. 8 points	A very good record of all four retrospective meetings, providing evidence of continuous process and teamwork improvement. 7 points	A good record of retrospective meetings showing process and teamwork improvements. 6 points	Average record of retrospective meetings showing process and teamwork improvements. 5 points	Pass: Basic evidence of retrospective meetings taking place on a regular basis. 4 points	Some record of retrospective meetings. 3 points	Very limited record of retrospective meetings. 2 points	Very limited record of retrospective meetings with major shortcomings or in unsuitable format. 1 point	None evident. 0 points

		this level. 10 points	improvement 9 points									
Quality of Report	10%	Clarity of writing, report structure, attention to spelling and grammar, wordcount and referencing style are beyond expectations. 10 points	Exceptional clarity of writing, report structure, attention to spelling and grammar, wordcount and referencing style. 9 points	Excellent clarity of writing, report structure, attention to spelling and grammar, wordcount and referencing style. 8 points	Very good writing, report structure, attention to spelling and grammar, wordcount and referencing style with only minor errors or omissions. 7 points	Good writing, structure, spelling, grammar and referencing but with some significant errors or omissions. 6 points	Average writing, structure, spelling, grammar, wordcount and referencing but with some significant errors or omissions. 5 points	Pass: Writing, structure, spelling, grammar, wordcount and/or referencing have many significant errors or omissions. 4 points	Poor writing with limited structure and/or poor spelling, grammar and/or referencing. 3 points	Very poor writing with limited structure and/or very poor spelling, grammar and/or referencing. 2 point	Very poor writing with major issues and omissions with structure, major spelling and grammar issues, wordcount, and/or referencing. 1 points	No structure, incoherent writing style and/or references. 0 points
Quality of Demonstration	10%	Presentation is beyond expectations, clearly and effectively demonstrating the product and deploying effective online presentation skills, including use of time. 10 points	Presentation is exceptional, very clearly and effectively demonstrating the product and deploying effective online presentation skills, including use of time. 9 points	Excellent presentation, very clearly and effectively demonstrating the product and deploying effective online presentation skills, including use of time. 8 points	Very good presentation, clearly and effectively demonstrating the product and deploying effective online presentation skills, including use of time. 7 points	Good presentation, clearly and effectively demonstrating the product and deploying effective online presentation skills, including use of time, but with some errors & omissions. 6 points	Average presentation, demonstrating the product and deploying basic online presentation skills but with poor use of time and/or some errors & omissions. 5 points	Pass: basic demonstration of the product and deploying basic online presentation skills but with poor use of time and/or many significant errors & omissions. 4 points	Limited presentation in terms of content, presentation skills and use of time. 3 points	Very limited presentation in terms of content, presentation skills and use of time. 2 points	Very limited presentation in terms of content, presentation skills and use of time. 1 point	No Presentation. 0 points

How to get help

We will discuss this Coursework specification in class. However, if you have related questions, please ask a question on the general chat or if too specific contact:

Lucia Otoyó (lucia.otoyo@lsbu.ac.uk) if you are a CSI student and
Andy Unger (ungerad@lsbu.ac.uk) if you are a law student.

Resources & Additional guidance

Example tools you can use to record your final demonstration:

- **MS Teams**
- **QuickTime** screen-recording (tip: enable see click on the pointer, to allow the viewer to see where you are clicking on the screen)
- **Kazam** (simple)
- **OBS** (Open Broadcaster Software) <https://obsproject.com/> – free, open-source video recording and broadcast/streaming software
- **FastStone Capture** (simple)
- **Camtasia** (advanced)
- **Zoom**
- <https://www.techsmith.com/video-editor.html> – also **camtasia.com** – easy to learn video recording and editing software. Not free.
- openshot.org – free, open-source video editing software

Recommended platform for hosting your video in YouTube.

Please consult with your tutor if you want to use a different platform or tool. There are plenty of suggestions online. The only thing to ensure is that access to the video is not restricted and can be viewed by all the tutors for moderation purposes.

Peer Evaluation form

Performance Related Adjustment

To make sure that everyone contributes fairly to the work of the team you are asked to evaluate yourself and each of your fellow team members.

Team code	e.g. L1	
Members	Names	Student Id
S1 (self)	Your Name...	Your ID...
S2		
S3		
S4		
S5		
S6		

5	4	3	2	1
Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor

Evaluation criteria	Student Mark (5, 4, 3, 2 or 1)					
	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6
1. Attends group meetings regularly and on time						
2. Contributes towards success of the project						
3. Completes assigned tasks on time & to quality						
4. Cooperative and supportive attitude towards team						
5. Listens and contributes meaningfully to discussions						
Total score (add rows 1 to 5 above)						

Constructive feedback to explain any high or low marks awarded:

The scores from each team member for each individual team member will be added up and then compared with the average score for the group (maximum score is 25). Team mark awarded will then be adjusted for individuals based on their score.

*****Tutor can make final adjustments to the marks based on CW1 self-reflection and in class observations. Individual marks can only go up by max 10 marks on top of the team report mark***

Quality assurance of coursework specifications

Coursework specifications within CSI division go through internal (for new modules with 100% coursework also through external) moderation. This is to ensure high quality, consistency and appropriateness of the coursework as well as to share best practice within the CSI division.

Details of the moderators for this coursework specification are below:

Moderated	Teaching team, September 2023
------------------	-------------------------------