COMP3900/9900
2022 Term 2
Project Report Assessment

❖ **Project Report** (due **Friday 5 August 2022 Week 10 @ 9.00pm**) (worth **20%**):
The project report should be prepared according to the instructions below and should at least include the following information:

1. Using similar format as the project proposal, your report should be **at least 20 pages long**, excluding the title page, the table of contents, and references pages, and be in **PDF** format that is readable with Acrobat.

2. Title page similar to that of the project proposal, with the project report submission date.

3. Table of contents and page numbers.

4. Overview - Architecture/design of the overall system and functionalities.

5. Descriptions of the functionalities developed by the team and how they map/address all project objectives.

6. Proper references and brief descriptions of ALL third-party functionalities (clouds/services/APIs/libraries/code) used by the team, with justification for their use and discussion how their licensing terms impact results of this project.

7. Implementation challenges: descriptions of any tricks, non-trivial algorithms, special architecture/design, etc.

8. User documentation/manual: how to build, setup, configure, and use your system and functionalities.

9. Use either APA (https://student.unsw.edu.au/apa) or Harvard (https://student.unsw.edu.au/harvard-referencing) referencing style.

The marking criteria that follow will be used for the Project Report assessment item.

Project Report Marking Criteria

COMP3900/9900 Term 2, 2022 Project Report Marking Rubric			
Team Name:			
	zID	**Name**	
Team Member 1:			
Team Member 2:			
Team Member 3:			
Team Member 4:			
Team Member 5:			
Category	**Max Mark**	**Team Mark**	**Comments**
Overview (10%)	**2**		
Fails to present the overall picture (design and architecture) of the project	0.4		
Provides vague/insufficient design and architecture descriptions	0.8		
Provides clear design and architecture, but has weaknesses or technical issues with them	1.2		
Provides clear and correct design and architecture	1.6		
Provides concise and professional presentation of design and architecture	2		
Functionalities and Implementation Challenges (50%)	**10**		
Clearly deficient, lack of any useful details	2		
"Thin" results, lacking intellectual engagement, lack of justifications	4		
Several functionalities of the software not coherently linked	6		
Solid, coherent work, linking all the functionalities together into a consistent story. Good description on solving difficult technical, research, or implementation issues	8		
Outstanding, coherent and consistent functionalities; and description on solving difficult technical, research, or implementation issues	10		
Installation/User Document/Manual (30%)	**6**		
Insufficient / incorrect instructions to compile, build, setup or use the software	1		
Unclear instructions but can still follow to build and run the software	2		
Easy to follow to build and setup. Some functionality documentation, but not enough information to cover all the functionality usages	4		
Complete and correct instructions	5		
Professional and concise instructions (correct and complete)	6		
Document Presentation, Title Page, References (10%)	**2**		
Impedes document reading or missing sections	0.4		
Poor formatting and document structure	0.8		
Poor judgement with respect to layout and possible padding	1.2		
Minor issues, but overall high quality	1.6		
Professional, easy to read and high quality presentation (such as layout and design)	2		
Total Mark (out of 20)	**20**	**0**	